arXiv:1401.5953v1 [cs.LO] 23 Jan 2014

# A Generalization of the Łoś-Tarski Preservation Theorem over Classes of Finite Structures

Abhisekh Sankaran, Bharat Adsul, Supratik Chakraborty

Department of Computer Science and Engineering,
IIT Bombay, Mumbai, India

January 24, 2014

**Abstract**

We investigate a generalization of the Łoś-Tarski preservation theorem via the semantic notion of *preservation under substructures modulo k-sized cores*. It was shown earlier that over arbitrary structures, this semantic notion for first-order logic corresponds to definability by $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentences. In this paper, we identify two properties of classes of finite structures that ensure the above correspondence. The first is based on well-quasi-ordering under the embedding relation. The second is a logic-based combinatorial property that strictly generalizes the first. We show that starting with classes satisfying any of these properties, the classes obtained by applying operations like disjoint union, cartesian and tensor products, or by forming words and trees over the classes, inherit the same property. As a fallout, we obtain interesting classes of structures over which an effective version of the Łoś-Tarski theorem holds.

Keywords: finite model theory, preservation theorem, well-quasi-ordering, composition method

## 1 Introduction

Preservation theorems in first-order logic (henceforth called FO) have been extensively studied in model theory [3]. A FO preservation theorem asserts that the collection of FO definable classes closed under a model-theoretic operation corresponds to the collection of classes definable by a syntactic fragment of FO. A classical preservation theorem is the Łoś-Tarski theorem, which states that over *arbitrary structures*, a FO sentence is preserved under substructures iff it is equivalent to a universal sentence [3]. In [11], it was conjectured that the Łoś-Tarski theorem can be generalized using a simple yet delicate semantic notion of a class of structures being *preserved under substructures modulo k-sized cores*. This semantic notion, denoted $\mathbb{PSC}(k)$ and explained in detail in Section 2, is parameterized by a quantitative model-theoretic parameter $k$. For $k = 0$, this

reduces to the usual notion of preservation under substructures. The conjecture in [11] was settled in [10], where it was shown that over arbitrary structures, a FO sentence is preserved under substructures modulo $k$-sized cores iff it is equivalent to a $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentence. This result, which we abbreviate as $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$, provides a non-trivial generalization of the Łoś-Tarski theorem.
Since classes of finite structures are the most interesting from a computational point of view, researchers have studied preservation theorems over finite structures in the past [1, 5, 2, 9]. Most preservation theorems, including the Łoś-Tarski theorem, fail over the class of all finite structures[1]. Recent works [1, 5] have studied structural and algorithmic properties of classes of finite structures that allow the Łoś-Tarski theorem to hold over these classes. Unfortunately, these studies don't suffice to identify classes over which $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ holds. In this paper, we try to fill this gap by formulating and studying new abstract properties of classes of finite structures. As a fallout of our studies, we not only identify interesting classes over which $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ holds for all $k \geq 0$, but also identify classes that lie beyond those studied by [1, 5] and yet satisfy the Łoś-Tarski theorem.
The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss preliminaries and set up the notation. Section 3 introduces a well-quasi-ordering based property and a logic-based combinatorial property of classes of finite structures, where both properties are parameterized by a natural number $k$. We show that $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ holds over classes satisfying these properties. We also formulate an 'effective' version of the logic-based property that allows us to compute from a sentence defining a class in $PSC(k)$, an equivalent $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentence. In Section 4, we undertake an exhaustive comparison of the collections of classes that the aforementioned properties define. We show in Section 5 that the classically interesting and well-studied classes of words and trees over a finite alphabet belong to these collections. Finally, in Section 6, we establish composition theorems for the above collections of classes under a set of natural composition operators such as disjoint union, cartesian and tensor products. We further show that the above collections are also closed under the operations of forming words and trees. The results in Sections 5 and 6 are amongst the most technically involved results in this paper. Throughout, we provide examples of interesting classes satisfying the various properties discussed.

## 2 Notation and Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the natural numbers *including zero*. We assume that the reader is familiar with standard notation and terminology of first-order logic. We consider only finite vocabularies, represented by $\tau$, that are relational (i.e. contain only predicate and constant symbols). Standard notions of *$\tau$-structures, substructures* and *extensions* (see [3]) are used throughout. *All $\tau$-structures considered in this paper are assumed to be finite.* Given a $\tau$-structure $\mathfrak{A}$, we use $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ to denote the universe of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $|\mathfrak{A}|$ to denote its cardinality or size. If $A$ is a

[1] A notable exception is the homomorphism preservation theorem [9].

subset of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, we use $\mathfrak{A}(A)$ to denote the substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ induced by $A$. Given $\tau$-structures $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, we use $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$ to denote that $\mathfrak{A}$ is a substructure of $\mathfrak{B}$. If $A$ and $B$ are sets, we also use $A \subseteq B$ to denote set containment. We say that $\mathfrak{A}$ *embeds* in $\mathfrak{B}$ if $\mathfrak{A}$ is isomorphic to a substructure of $\mathfrak{B}$. Notationally, we represent this as $\mathfrak{A} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}$. It is easy to see that $\hookrightarrow$ is a pre-order over any class of $\tau$-structures. *All classes of $\tau$-structures, and subclasses thereof, considered in this paper are assumed to be closed under isomorphism.*
We denote by $FO(\tau)$ the set of all FO formulae over $\tau$. A sequence $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ of variables is written as $\bar{x}$. For notational convenience, we abbreviate a block of quantifiers of the form $Qx_1 \ldots Qx_k$ by $Q^k\bar{x}$, where $Q \in \{\forall, \exists\}$. Given a $\tau$-structure $\mathfrak{A}$ and a $FO(\tau)$ sentence $\varphi$, if $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi$, we say that $\mathfrak{A}$ is a *model* of $\varphi$. Given a class $\mathcal{S}$ of $\tau$-structures of interest, every $FO(\tau)$ sentence $\varphi$ defines a unique subclass of $\mathcal{S}$ consisting of all models of $\varphi$. Therefore, when $\mathcal{S}$ is clear from the context, we interchangeably talk of a set of $FO(\tau)$ sentences and the corresponding collection of subclasses of $\mathcal{S}$.
The notion of a class of $\tau$-structures being preserved under substructures modulo bounded cores was introduced in [11]. This notion is central to our work. The following is an adapted version of the definition given in [11].

**Definition 2.1** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of $\tau$-structures and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A subclass $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is said to be* preserved under substructures modulo $k$-sized cores over $\mathcal{S}$ *if every $\tau$-structure $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ has a subset* $\mathsf{Core}$ *of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ such that (i) $|\mathsf{Core}| \leq k$, and (ii) for every $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$, if $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathsf{Core} \subseteq \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{C}$. The set* $\mathsf{Core}$ *is called a $k$-core of $\mathfrak{A}$ with respect to $\mathcal{C}$ over $\mathcal{S}$.*

As an example, if $\mathcal{S}$ represents the class of all graphs, the subclass $\mathcal{C}$ of acyclic graphs is preserved under substructures module $k$-sized cores over $\mathcal{S}$, for every $k \geq 0$. Like Definition 2.1, most other definitions, discussions and results in this paper are stated with respect to an underlying class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures. For notational convenience, when $\mathcal{S}$ is clear from the context, we omit mentioning "over $\mathcal{S}$". In Definition 2.1, if the subclass $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are also clear from the context, we call $\mathsf{Core}$ simply as a core of $\mathfrak{A}$.
Given a class $\mathcal{S}$, let $\mathbb{PSC}(k)$ denote the collection of all subclasses of $\mathcal{S}$ that are preserved under substructures modulo $k$-sized cores. As shown by the example of acyclic graphs above, $\mathbb{PSC}(k)$ may contain subclasses that are not definable over $\mathcal{S}$ by any FO sentence. Since our focus in this paper is on classes definable by FO sentences, we define $PSC(k)$ to be the collection of classes in $\mathbb{PSC}(k)$ that are definable over $\mathcal{S}$ by FO sentences. As before, we interchangeably talk of $PSC(k)$ as a collection of classes and as a set of the defining FO sentences. Since $\mathbb{PSC}(0)$ coincides with the property of preservation under substructures, we abbreviate $\mathbb{PSC}(0)$ as $\mathbb{PS}$ and $PSC(0)$ as $PS$ in the remainder of the paper. Given $k, p \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\exists^k\forall^p$ denote the set of all $FO(\tau)$ sentences in prenex normal form whose quantifier prefix has $k$ existential quantifiers followed by $p$ universal quantifiers. We use $\exists^k\forall^*$ to denote $\bigcup_{p\in\mathbb{N}} \exists^k\forall^p$. As before, when the class $\mathcal{S}$ of $\tau$-structures is clear from the context, we use $\exists^k\forall^p$ and $\exists^k\forall^*$ to also denote the corresponding subclasses of $\mathcal{S}$. We refer the reader to [11] for interesting ex-

amples from the collections $\mathbb{PS}, PS, \forall^*, \mathbb{PSC}(k), PSC(k), \exists^k\forall^*$ and for inclusion relationships among these collections.
Using the above notation, the Łoś-Tarski theorem can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 2.2** *Over arbitrary structures,* $PS = \forall^*$.

In [10], this was generalized to give the following result.

**Theorem 2.3** *Over arbitrary structures, for every* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$.

It is easy to see that if $\varphi$ is an $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentence and $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi$, then every witness of the existential variables of $\varphi$ forms a $k$-core of $\mathfrak{A}$. However, the converse is not necessarily true [11]. Specifically, let $\tau = \{E\}$, where $E$ is a binary predicate. Consider the $FO(\tau)$ sentence $\varphi \equiv \exists x \forall y\, E(x, y)$, and the $\tau$-structure $\mathfrak{A}$ defined by $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}} = \{0, 1\}$ and $E^{\mathfrak{A}} = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi$ and there is only one witness of the existential quantifier, viz. 0. However, both $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$ are cores of $\mathfrak{A}$!
In [11], the notion of *relativizing* a FO sentence with respect to a finite set of variables was introduced. We recall this for later use. Let $\mathsf{Const}$ be the set of constants in a relational vocabulary $\tau$. Given a sentence $\phi$ over $\tau$ and a sequence of variables $\bar{x}$, let $\phi|_{\bar{x}}$ denote the quantifier-free formula with free variables $\bar{x}$, obtained as follows. Suppose $X$ is the underlying set of $\bar{x}$. We first replace every $\forall$ in $\phi$ by $\neg\exists$, and then replace every subformula of the form $\exists x\, \psi(x, y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ by $\bigvee_{z \in X \cup \mathsf{Const}} \psi(z, y_1, \ldots, y_k)$. The formula $\phi|_{\bar{x}}$ is called $\phi$ *relativized to* $X$. Informally, given a $\tau$-structure $\mathfrak{A}$, the formula $\phi|_{\bar{x}}$ asserts that $\phi$ is true in the substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ induced by the underlying set of $\bar{x}$. More precisely, for every $(a_1, \ldots a_k) \in \mathsf{U}^k_{\mathfrak{A}}$, we have $(\mathfrak{A}, a_1, \ldots, a_k) \models \phi|_{\bar{x}}$ iff $\mathfrak{A}(\{a_1, \ldots, a_k\}) \models \phi$.
As mentioned in Section 1, recent studies have identified structural and algorithmic properties of classes of finite structures that allow $PS = \forall^*$ to hold over these classes [1, 5]. For example, the class of structures whose Gaifman graph is acyclic was shown to admit $PS = \forall^*$ in [1]. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the class of graphs, where each graph is a disjoint union of finite undirected paths. Clearly, every such graph has an acyclic Gaifman graph, and hence $PS = \forall^*$ over $\mathcal{S}$. However, as shown in [11], $PSC(k) \neq \exists^k\forall^*$, for every $k \geq 2$, over $\mathcal{S}$. This motivates us to ask: *Can we identify abstract properties of classes of finite structures that allow* $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ *to hold over these classes?* Our primary contribution is the identification of two properties that answer the above question affirmatively.

# 3 Two Properties of Classes of Structures

We define two properties of classes of finite structures, each of which entails $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ over the class.

## 3.1 A property based on well-quasi-orders

Recall that a pre-order $(\Pi, \preceq)$ is *well-quasi-ordered* (w.q.o.) if for every infinite sequence $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots$ of elements of $\Pi$, there exists $i < j$ such that $\pi_i \preceq \pi_j$ (see [4]).

If $(\Pi, \preceq)$ is a w.q.o., we say that "$\Pi$ is a w.q.o. under $\preceq$". It is a basic fact that if $\Pi$ is a w.q.o. under $\preceq$, then for every infinite sequence $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots$ of elements of $\Pi$ there exists an infinite subsequence $\pi_{i_1}, \pi_{i_2}, \ldots$ such that $i_1 < i_2 < \ldots$ and $\pi_{i_1} \preceq \pi_{i_2} \preceq \ldots$.

Given a vocabulary $\tau$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tau_k$ denote the vocabulary obtained by adding $k$ new constant symbols to $\tau$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of structures. We use $\mathcal{S}_k$ to denote the class of all $\tau_k$-structures whose $\tau$-reducts are structures in $\mathcal{S}$. Our first property, denoted $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, can now be defined as follows.

**Definition 3.1** *If $S_k$ is a w.q.o under the isomorphic embedding relation $\hookrightarrow$, we say that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds.*

Observe that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ holds iff $\mathcal{S}$ is a w.q.o. under $\hookrightarrow$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds and $\mathcal{S}'$ is a subclass of $\mathcal{S}$, then $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}', k)$ holds as well. If $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite class of structures, then $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds trivially for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The next lemma provides a more interesting example.

**Lemma 3.2** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the class of all finite linear orders. Then $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof:* Fix $k$. Let $I = (\mathfrak{A}_i, a_i^1, \ldots, a_i^k)_{i \geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence of elements from $\mathcal{S}_k$. Since there are only finitely many order-types of a $k$-tuple from a linear order, there exists an infinite subsequence $J = (\mathfrak{B}_j, b_j^1, \ldots, b_j^k)_{j \geq 1}$ of $I$ such that the order-type of $b_j^1, \ldots, b_j^k$ in $\mathfrak{B}_j$ is the same for all $j$.

Consider an element $(\mathfrak{B}, b^1, \ldots, b^k)$ of $J$. Let $b^0$ and $b^{k+1}$ be the minimum and maximum elements of $\mathfrak{B}$. W.l.o.g. assume $b^0 \leq_{\mathfrak{B}} b^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{B}} \ldots \leq_{\mathfrak{B}} b^k \leq_{\mathfrak{B}} b^{k+1}$ where $\leq_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is the linear order of $\mathfrak{B}$. Then $(\mathfrak{B}, b^1, \ldots, b^k)$ can be represented (upto isomorphism) by a $(k+1)$-tuple $t_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \mathbb{N}^{k+1}$, where the $r^{\text{th}}$ component of $t_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is $|\{b \mid b \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}, b^{r-1} \leq_{\mathfrak{B}} b \leq_{\mathfrak{B}} b^r\}|$. Applying Dickson's lemma to the sequence $(t_{\mathfrak{B}_j})_{j \geq 1}$ there exist $p, q$ such that $p < q$ and $t_{\mathfrak{B}_p}$ is component-wise $\leq t_{\mathfrak{B}_q}$. Since a linear order of length $m$ can always be embedded in a linear order of length $n$ for $n \geq m$, it follows that $(\mathfrak{B}_p, b_p^1, \ldots, b_p^k) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{B}_q, b_q^1, \ldots, b_q^k)$. Hence, $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds. ∎

As a "mixed-example", consider $\mathcal{S}$ to be the class of all finite (undirected) paths. It is easy to see that both $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 1)$ hold. However, $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ fails for all $k \geq 2$. We illustrate this failure for $k = 2$. Consider the sequence $(\mathfrak{A}_i)_{i \geq 2}$ of structures from $\mathcal{S}_2$, where $\mathfrak{A}_i = (P_i, a_i, b_i)$ and $P_i$ is a path of length $i$ with end-points $a_i$ and $b_i$. It is easy to check that for all $i \neq j$, $\mathfrak{A}_i \not\hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}_j$.

The following lemma provides a "logical" characterization of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$. The proof can be found in Appendix A.

**Lemma 3.3** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of structures. $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ holds iff $\mathbb{PS} = \mathbb{PSC}(0) = \forall^*$ over $\mathcal{S}$.*

We are now ready to state the main result of this subsection.

**Proposition 3.4** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of structures such that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds. Then $\mathbb{PSC}(k) = \exists^k \forall^*$ over $\mathcal{S}$.*

*Proof:* Consider $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{PSC}(k)$ over $S$. Define $\mathcal{D}$ to be the subclass of $\mathcal{S}_k$ consisting of all elements $(M, a_1, \ldots, a_k)$, where $M \in \mathcal{C}$ and the underlying set of $(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ is a $k$-core of $M$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{C}$ over $\mathcal{S}$. It follows from Definition 2.1 that $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{PSC}(0)$ over $\mathcal{S}_k$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, by definition, $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_k, 0)$ holds. By Lemma 3.3, $\mathcal{D}$ is definable by a $\forall^*$ sentence $\psi$ over $\mathcal{S}_k$. We now replace each constant in $\tau_k \setminus \tau$ that appears in $\psi$ by a fresh variable, and existentially quantify these variables to get a $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentence defining $\mathcal{C}$ over $\mathcal{S}$. ■

## 3.2 A logic-based combinatorial property

For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau$-structures $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are said to be *$m$-equivalent*, denoted $\mathfrak{A} \equiv_m \mathfrak{B}$, iff $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ agree on the truth of every $FO(\tau)$ sentence of quantifier rank $\leq m$. We assume the reader is familiar with *Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games* (henceforth called EF games) [7, 6]. The classical Ehrenfeuct-Fraïssé theorem (henceforth called EF theorem) states that $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are $m$-equivalent iff the duplicator has a winning strategy in the $m$-round EF game between $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of structures. Our second property, namely $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, can now be stated as follows.

**Definition 3.5** *Suppose there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, for each structure $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ and for each subset $W$ of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ of size at most $k$, there exists $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ such that (i) $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$, (ii) $W \subseteq \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, (iii) $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq f(m)$ and (iv) $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$. Then, we say that $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, and call $f(m)$ a* witness function *of $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$.*

Clearly, if $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds and $\mathcal{S}'$ is a subclass of $\mathcal{S}$ that is preserved under substructures over $\mathcal{S}$, then $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}', k)$ also holds.
Revisiting the examples of the previous subsection, we see that if $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite class, then $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds with $f(m)$ being the constant function that returns the size of the largest structure in $\mathcal{S}$. For linear orders, we have the following result.

**Lemma 3.6** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the class of all finite linear orders. Then $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof:* Fix $m$ and $k$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}$ and let $W = \{a_1, \ldots, a_r\}$, $r \leq k$ be a subset of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Define $f(m) = \max\{2^m, k\}$. We now show that there is a linear sub-order $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ such that $\mathfrak{B}$ contains $W$, $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq f(m)$ and $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$.
If $|\mathfrak{A}| \leq f(m)$, choose $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}$, and we are done. Otherwise, let $\mathfrak{B}$ be any substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ that contains $W$ and is of size $f(m)$. Observe that, in this case, both $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are of size at least $2^m$. It is well-known that any two linear orders of length $\geq 2^m$ are $m$-equivalent. Hence, $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$, and all conditions in Definition 3.5 are satisfied by $\mathfrak{B}$. ■
Finally, if $\mathcal{S}$ is the class of all finite paths, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 1)$ hold. However, $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ fails for all $k \geq 2$. This is because if $\mathfrak{A}$ is a path containing two distinct end-points, and if $W$ contains both these end-points, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is its *only* substructure *in* $\mathcal{S}$ that contains $W$. This precludes

the existence of a uniform (i.e. independent of $|\mathfrak{A}|$) function $f(m)$ bounding the size of a substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ containing $W$, as required in Definition 3.5.
The next theorem is one of the main results of this paper. Before stating the theorem, we note that given a class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the subclass of all structures in $\mathcal{S}$ of size $\leq n$ is definable over $\mathcal{S}$ by a FO sentence in $\exists^n\forall^*$. We call this sentence $\xi_{\mathcal{S},n}$ in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.7** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of structures and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds. Then $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ over $\mathcal{S}$. More precisely, for every defining FO sentence $\phi$ in $PSC(k)$ over $\mathcal{S}$, there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi$ is semantically equivalent to $\exists^k\bar{x}\forall^p\bar{y}\ \psi|_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}$ over $\mathcal{S}$, where $\psi \equiv (\xi_{\mathcal{S},k+p} \rightarrow \phi)$.*

*Proof:* It is obvious that $\exists^k\forall^* \subseteq PSC(k)$ over $\mathcal{S}$. To prove containment in the other direction, consider $\phi$ in $PSC(k)$ over $\mathcal{S}$, and let $\phi$ have quantifier rank $m$. Let $f(m)$ be the witness function of $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. Consider the sentence $\varphi \equiv \exists^k\bar{x}\forall^p\bar{y}\ \psi|_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}$, where $p = f(m)$. Since $\phi$ is in $PSC(k)$ over $\mathcal{S}$, every model $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\phi$ in $\mathcal{S}$ also satisfies $\varphi$. To see why this is so, note that the elements of any $k$-core of $\mathfrak{A}$ can serve as witnesses of the existential variables in $\varphi$. Therefore, $\phi \rightarrow \varphi$ over $\mathcal{S}$. To show $\varphi \rightarrow \phi$ over $\mathcal{S}$, suppose $\mathfrak{A}$ is a model of $\varphi$ in $\mathcal{S}$. Let $W$ be the set of witnesses in $\mathfrak{A}$ for the $k$ existential variables in $\varphi$. Clearly, $|W| \leq k$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, there exists $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ such that (i) $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$, (ii) $W \subseteq \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, (iii) $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq f(m) = p$, and (iii) $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$. Since $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi$, by instantiating the universal variables in $\varphi$ with the elements of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$. Since the quantifier rank of $\phi$ is $m$ and $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$, it follows that $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$. Therefore, $\phi$ is semantically equivalent to $\varphi$ over $\mathcal{S}$. This proves the theorem. ■
**Remark:** Suppose $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}$ is a model of $\phi$, and $\bar{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) \in \mathsf{U}^k_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Define $\phi'(\bar{x}) \equiv \forall^p\bar{y}\ \psi|_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}$. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi'(\bar{a})$ iff the underlying-set $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k\}$ is a $k$-core of $\mathfrak{A}$ w.r.t. $\phi$. Thus, the $k$-cores of $\phi$ are defined by the FO formula $\phi'(\bar{x})$ if $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds.
The witness function $f(m)$ in the definition of $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ may not be computable, in general. By requiring $f$ to be *computable* in Definition 3.5, we obtain an effective version of $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, which we call $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. Note that for all examples considered so far where $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, we actually gave closed form expressions for $f(m)$. Hence $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ also holds for these classes. We will soon see a class $\mathcal{S}$ that is in $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, but not in $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$.
The following is an important corollary of Theorem 3.7.

**Corollary 3.8** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of structures and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds. For every $\phi$ in $PSC(k)$ over $\mathcal{S}$, the translation to a semantically equivalent (over $\mathcal{S}$) $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentence $\varphi$ is effective.*

# 4 Relations between properties

We begin by comparing the classes for which $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ hold with those for which $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ hold. Surprisingly, it turns out that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ implies $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$!

**Proposition 4.1** *For each class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures and each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, then $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds as well.*

*Proof*: We give a proof by contradiction. Suppose, if possible, $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds but $P_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ fails. By Definition 3.5, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a structure $\mathfrak{A}_p$ in $\mathcal{S}$ and a set $W_p$ of at most $k$ elements of $\mathfrak{A}_p$ such that for any substructure $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}_p$, we have $\big((\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}) \wedge (W_p \subseteq \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}) \wedge (|\mathfrak{B}| \leq p)\big) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B} \not\equiv_m \mathfrak{A}_p)$.
For each $p \geq 1$, fix the structure $\mathfrak{A}_p$ and the set $W_p$ that satisfy these properties. Now, let $\bar{a}_p$ be any $k$-tuple such that the components of $\bar{a}_p$ are exactly the elements of $W_p$. Let $\mathfrak{A}'_p$ be the $\tau_k$-structure $(\mathfrak{A}_p, \bar{a}_p)$ in $\mathcal{S}_k$. Consider the sequence $(\mathfrak{A}'_i)_{i \geq 1}$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, $\mathcal{S}_k$ is a w.q.o. under $\hookrightarrow$. Therefore, there exists an infinite sequence of indices $I = (i_1, i_2, \ldots)$ such that $i_1 < i_2 < \ldots$ and $\mathfrak{A}'_{i_1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}'_{i_2} \hookrightarrow \ldots$. Let $\Delta$ be the set of all equivalence classes of the $\equiv_m$ relation over the class of all $\tau$-structures. Given $m$ and $\tau$, $\Delta$ is clearly a finite set. Therefore, there exists an infinite subsequence $J$ of $I$ with indices $j_1 < j_2 < \ldots$ such that (i) $\mathfrak{A}'_{j_1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}'_{j_2} \hookrightarrow \ldots$, and (ii) the corresponding $\tau$-reducts $\mathfrak{A}_{j_1}, \mathfrak{A}_{j_2}, \ldots$ are $m$-equivalent. Let $r = |\mathfrak{A}'_{j_1}|$ (which is the same as $|\mathfrak{A}_{j_1}|$) and let $n > 1$ be an index such that $j_n \geq r$. Then $\mathfrak{A}'_{j_1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}'_{j_n}$ and $\mathfrak{A}_{j_1} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}_{j_n}$. Fix an embedding $\imath : \mathfrak{A}'_{j_1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}'_{j_n}$ in $\mathcal{S}_k$. We abuse notation and denote the induced embedding of $\imath$ on the $\tau$-reducts also by $\imath : \mathfrak{A}_{j_1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{j_n}$ in $\mathcal{S}$.
Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the image of $\mathfrak{A}_{j_1}$ under $\imath$. Then $\mathfrak{B}$ has the following properties: (i) $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$, since $\mathfrak{A}_{j_1} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is closed under isomorphisms, (ii) $W_{j_n} \subseteq \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, since $\imath : (\mathfrak{A}_{j_1}, \bar{a}_{j_1}) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{A}_{j_n}, \bar{a}_{j_n})$ and the components of $\bar{a}_{j_n}$ are exactly the elements of $W_{j_n}$, (iii) $|\mathfrak{B}| = r \leq j_n$, and (iv) $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}_{j_n}$. This contradicts the property of $\mathfrak{A}_{j_n}$ stated at the outset, completing the proof. ■

Given the above result, it is natural to ask whether $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ implies $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ as well. Proposition 4.2 provides a strong negative answer to this question.

**Proposition 4.2** *There exists a class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures for which $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, and hence $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, but $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ fails, and hence $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ fails for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof:* Recall that the set of all computable functions from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N}$ is countable. Fix an enumeration $f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3, \cdots$ of the computable functions. Now define a class $\mathcal{S}$ of words over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$ as follows: $\mathcal{S} = \{w_i = ab^i ac^{f_i(i+3)} \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We show in Section 5 that the class $\Sigma^*$ of all finite words satisfies $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\Sigma^*, k)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ also holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now we prove by contradiction that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ fails. If possible, suppose $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ holds, and let $f_r(m)$ be a computable witness function for $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$. Consider the word $w_r = ab^r ac^{f_r(r+3)}$. By definition of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$, there exists a subword $w' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $|w'| \leq f_r(r+3)$ and $w' \equiv_{r+3} w_r$. Since $w' \equiv_{r+3} w_r$, it is easy to see that $w'$ and $w_r$ must agree on the first $r+2$ letters. However, since $w'$ must also be in $\mathcal{S}$, by the definition of $\mathcal{S}$, we must choose $w' = w_r$. This contradicts $|w'| \leq f_r(r+3)$. ■

**Remark:** If $\mathcal{S}$ is recursively enumerable, the witness function in Definition 3.5 lies in the second level of the Turing hierarchy. See Appendix B for a proof.

The following proposition, along with Proposition 4.2 shows that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},k)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S},k)$ are incomparable.

**Proposition 4.3** *There exists a class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures for which $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},k)$ holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, but $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S},0)$ fails, and hence $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S},k)$ fails for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof sketch:* Let $C_n$ (respectively, $P_n$) denote an undirected cycle (respectively, path) of length $n$. Let $mP_n$ denote the disjoint union of $m$ copies of $P_n$. Let $H_n = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{i=3^n} nP_i$ and $G_n = C_{3^n} \sqcup H_n$, where $\sqcup$ denotes disjoint union. Now consider the class $\mathcal{S}$ of undirected graphs given by $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$, where $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{H_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{G_n \mid n \geq 1\}$. That $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S},0)$ fails is easily seen by considering the sequence $(G_n)_{n\geq 1}$, and noting that $C_{3^n}$ cannot embed in $C_{3^m}$ unless $m = n$. The proof that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},k)$ holds for all $k$ is deferred to Appendix C. ■

Towards a comparison of classes satisfying the various properties defined above, we consider the following eight natural collections of classes and study the relations between them.

1) $\Gamma^0_{wqo} = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S},0) \text{ holds }\}$
2) $\Gamma^*_{wqo} = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \forall k\, \mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S},k) \text{ holds }\}$
3) $\Gamma^0_{logic} = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},0) \text{ holds }\}$
4) $\Gamma^*_{logic} = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \forall k\, \mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},k) \text{ holds }\}$
5) $\Gamma^0_{comp} = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},0) \text{ holds }\}$
6) $\Gamma^*_{comp} = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \forall k\, \mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S},k) \text{ holds }\}$
7) $\Gamma^0 = \{\mathcal{S} \mid PS = PSC(0) = \forall^* \text{ over } \mathcal{S}\}$
8) $\Gamma^* = \{\mathcal{S} \mid \forall k\, PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^* \text{ over } \mathcal{S}\}$

Note that $\Gamma^0$ (repectively, $\Gamma^*$) is the collection of all classes of finite structures over which the Łoś-Tarski theorem (respectively, $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$) holds. Using $\subseteq$ to denote containment for collections of classes, it is trivial to see that $\Gamma^* \subseteq \Gamma^0$, $\Gamma^*_{wqo} \subseteq \Gamma^0_{wqo}$, $\Gamma^*_{logic} \subseteq \Gamma^0_{logic}$, $\Gamma^*_{comp} \subseteq \Gamma^0_{comp}$, $\Gamma^*_{comp} \subseteq \Gamma^*_{logic}$ and $\Gamma^0_{comp} \subseteq \Gamma^0_{logic}$.



The "Hasse" diagram $\mathcal{D}$ above depicts all containment relations between the above eight collections. Every directed arrow represents a "primary" containment. Some of these containments have already been discussed above. The remaining follow from Theorem 3.7 and from Proposition 4.1. Every pair of unordered collections in the diagram represents incomparable collections. We also annotate every directed arrow with a label that refers to an example demonstrating the *strictness* of the containment. The list of examples used to show strict containments is as follows.

- $\mathcal{S}_1$ is the class of all undirected paths.
- $\mathcal{S}_2$ is the class of all undirected cycles.
- $\mathcal{S}_3$ is the class of all undirected graphs that are disjoint unions of paths.
- $\mathcal{S}_4$ is the class of structures constructed in the proof of Proposition 4.3.
- $\mathcal{S}_5$ is the class of words constructed in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

For each example in the above list, we indicate below all the lowest/minimal collections in $\mathcal{D}$ that contains it, and all the highest/maximal collections in $\mathcal{D}$ that does not contain it. Due to lack of space, proofs of these inclusions/non-inclusions are deferred to Appendix D. We discuss only the inclusions/non-inclusions of $\mathcal{S}_2$ in detail below.

- $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^0_{wqo}$, $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^0_{comp}$, $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^*$, $\mathcal{S}_1 \notin \Gamma^*_{logic}$.
- $\mathcal{S}_2 \in \Gamma^*$, $\mathcal{S}_2 \notin \Gamma^0_{logic}$.
- $\mathcal{S}_3 \in \Gamma^0_{wqo}$, $\mathcal{S}_3 \in \Gamma^0_{comp}$, $\mathcal{S}_3 \notin \Gamma^*$.
- $\mathcal{S}_4 \in \Gamma^*_{comp}$, $\mathcal{S}_4 \notin \Gamma^0_{wqo}$.
- $\mathcal{S}_5 \in \Gamma^*_{wqo}$, $\mathcal{S}_5 \notin \Gamma^0_{comp}$.

**Lemma 4.4** *The class $\mathcal{S}_2$ belongs to $\Gamma^* \setminus \Gamma^0_{logic}$.*

*Proof:* For any cycle $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_2$, the only substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$ is $\mathfrak{A}$ itself. It follows that $\mathcal{S}_2 \notin \Gamma^0_{logic}$. We now show that $\mathcal{S}_2 \in \Gamma^*$. Firstly, observe that *any* subclass of $\mathcal{S}_2$ is in $\mathbb{PS}$ over $\mathcal{S}_2$. So, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{S}_2$ belongs to $\Gamma^0$. Towards this, let $\phi$ be in $PS$ over $\mathcal{S}_2$, and suppose the quantifier rank of $\phi$ is $m$. It is well-known that any two cycles of sizes $\geq p = 2^m$ are $m$-equivalent. Then either (i) all cycles of size $\geq p$ are models of $\phi$ or (ii) all models of $\phi$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$ have sizes $< p$.
In case (i), we define $\phi' = \forall^p \bar{y}\ \psi|_{\bar{y}}$ where $\psi \equiv \xi_{\mathcal{S}_2,p} \rightarrow \phi$ and $\xi_{\mathcal{S}_2,p}$ is as in Theorem 3.7. It is easy to verify that (a) all cycles of size $> p$ are models of $\phi'$, and (b) a cycle of length $\leq p$ is a model of $\phi$ iff it is a model of $\phi'$. Therefore, $\phi$ is equivalent to $\phi'$ over $\mathcal{S}_2$.
In case (ii), let $X$ be the finite set of the sizes of all models of $\phi$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$. It is trivial to see that there exists a quantifier-free formula $\xi'_X(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p)$ which

asserts the following: if the substructure induced by $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p$ is a cycle, then its size belongs to $X$. From here, it is easy to check that $\phi$ is equivalent to $\forall^p \bar{y} \xi'_X(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p)$ over $\mathcal{S}_2$.
In either case, we have shown that $\phi$ is equivalent to a $\forall^*$-sentence over $\mathcal{S}_2$. This proves that $\mathcal{S}_2$ belongs to $\Gamma^*$. ■

# 5 Words and trees over a finite alphabet

Given a finite alphabet $\Sigma$, let $Words(\Sigma)$ and $Trees(\Sigma)$ denote the set of all finite words and finite trees, respectively, over $\Sigma$. In this section, we show that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ hold for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, in each of the two cases, $\mathcal{S} = Words(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S} = Trees(\Sigma)$.
Various representations of trees have been used in the literature. In this paper, we use the following poset-theoretic representation. A tree is a finite poset $P = (A, \leq)$ with a unique minimal element (called root), and for every $a, b, c \in A$, $\big((a \leq c) \ \wedge \ (b \leq c)\big) \rightarrow \big(a \leq b \ \vee \ b \leq a\big)$. Informally, the Hasse diagram of $P$ is an (inverted) tree with $p$ connected to $c$ for every parent $p$ and its child $c$.
A tree over $\Sigma$ (henceforth called a $\Sigma$-*tree*) is a pair $(P, f)$ where $P = (A, \leq)$ is a tree and $f : A \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a labeling function. The elements of $A$ are also called nodes (or elements) of the $\Sigma$-tree $((A, \leq), f)$. We use $root_s$ to denote the root of a $\Sigma$-tree $s$. In the special case where the underlying poset is a linear order, a $\Sigma$-tree is called a $\Sigma$-word.
Let $\tau$ be the vocabulary $\{\leq\} \cup \{Q_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}$, where $\leq$ is a binary predicate and each $Q_a$ is a unary predicate. A $\Sigma$-tree $t = ((A, \leq_t), f)$ can be naturally represented as a structure $\mathfrak{A}_t$ over $\tau$. Specifically, $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_t} = A$, the interpretation $\leq^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$ is the same as $\leq_t$, and for every $a \in \Sigma$, $Q_a^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$ represents the set of all elements of $A$ labeled $a$ by $f$. For the special case of a $\Sigma$-word $w$, we let $A$ be $\{1, \ldots |w|\}$, and use $w[j]$ to denote the letter at the $j^{th}$ position of $w$. A $\Sigma$-forest $\mathsf{f}$ is a (finite) disjoint union of $\Sigma$-trees. We use the disjoint union of the $\tau$-structures representing the $\Sigma$-trees in $\mathsf{f}$ to represent the $\Sigma$-forest $\mathsf{f}$. For clarity of exposition, we abuse notation and use $t$ to denote both a $\Sigma$-tree and the corresponding $\tau$-structure $\mathfrak{A}_t$, when it is clear from the context which of these we are referring to.
Given two $\Sigma$-trees $s = ((A_s, \leq_s), f_s)$ and $t = ((A_t, \leq_t), f_t)$, and an element $e$ of $s$, the *join of* $t$ *to* $s$ *at* $e$, denoted $s \cdot_e t$, is the $\Sigma$-tree defined upto isomorphism as follows. Let $t' = ((A'_t, \leq'_t), f'_t)$ be an isomorphic copy of $t$ such that $A_s \cap A'_t = \emptyset$. Then $s \cdot_e t$ is the $\Sigma$-tree $((A, \leq), f)$, where (i) $A = A_s \cup A'_t$ (ii) $f$ is: $f_s$ on $A_s$ and $f'_t$ on $A'_t$, and (iii) $\leq \ = \leq_s \cup \leq'_t \cup \{(c, d) \mid c \leq_s e, \ c \in A_s, \ d \in A'_t\}$. Given $\Sigma$-trees $s$ and $t$ as above, we say $t$ is a *subtree* of $s$ if (i) $A_t \subseteq A_s$, (ii) $\leq_t$ is the restriction of $\leq_s$ to $A_t$, and (iii) $f_t$ is the restriction of $f_s$ to $A_t$. If $s$ is a $\Sigma$-word, a subtree of $s$ is also called a *subword*. Given a $\Sigma$-tree $s$, a $\Sigma$-forest $\mathsf{f} = \sqcup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} t_i$ and an element $e$ of $s$, the *the join of* $\mathsf{f}$ *to* $s$ *at* $e$, denoted $s \cdot_e \mathsf{f}$, is the $\Sigma$-tree defined upto isomorphism as $((((s \cdot_e t_1) \cdot_e t_2) \cdots) \cdot_e t_n)$.

## 5.1 $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ for words and trees

The primary result of this subsection is the following.

**Proposition 5.1** *Given a finite alphabet $\Sigma$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(Words(\Sigma), k)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(Trees(\Sigma), k)$ hold.*

Our proof goes via an alternative definition of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. Given a vocabulary $\tau$ and a unary predicate $R \notin \tau$, let $\tau_R$ denote the vocabulary $\tau \cup \{R\}$. For a class $\mathcal{S}$ of $\tau$-structures, we denote by $\mathcal{S}^k$ the class of all $\tau_R$-structures $(\mathfrak{A}, R^{\mathfrak{A}})$ s.t. $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $|R^{\mathfrak{A}}| \leq k$. The following lemma shows that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}^k, 0)$ serves as an alternative definition of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$.

**Lemma 5.2** *For every class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds iff $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}^k, 0)$ holds.*

It is trivial to see that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ implies $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}^k, 0)$. See Appendix E for a proof of converse.
Proposition 5.1 can now be proved using the above definition of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. We first consider the class $Words(\Sigma)$. Let $(w_i, R_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence of structures from $Words(\Sigma)^k$. Define $\widetilde{\Sigma} = \{\tilde{a} \mid a \in \Sigma\}$, where $\tilde{a} \notin \Sigma$ for each $a \in \Sigma$. Let $v_i$ be a word over $\Sigma \cup \widetilde{\Sigma}$ s.t. (i) $|v_i| = |w_i|$, and (ii) for $j$ ranging over the positions of $w_i$, $v_i[j] = w_i[j]$ if $j \notin R_i$, and $v_i[j] = \widetilde{w_i[j]}$ otherwise. Now consider the sequence of words $v_1, v_2, \ldots$ over $\Sigma \cup \widetilde{\Sigma}$. By Higman's Lemma, there exist $i, j$ s.t. $i < j$ and $v_i$ is a subword of $v_j$. It follows that $(w_i, R_i) \hookrightarrow (w_j, R_j)$, when viewed as $\tau_R$-structures. The proof for the class $Trees(\Sigma)$ is similar, and uses Kruskal's tree theorem instead of Higman's lemma. ■

## 5.2 $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ for words and trees

We now prove the counterpart of Proposition 5.1 for $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$.

**Proposition 5.3** *Given a finite alphabet $\Sigma$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Words(\Sigma), k)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Trees(\Sigma), k)$ hold.*

Since the result for $Trees(\Sigma)$ subsumes that for $Words(\Sigma)$, we discuss the proof only for $Trees(\Sigma)$.
The proof of Proposition 5.3 makes crucial use of a helper lemma. To help explain the lemma, we introduce some notation. Given an alphabet $\Sigma$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Delta(m, \Sigma)$ denote the set of all equivalence classes of the $\equiv_m$ relation over $Trees(\Sigma)$. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a function such that $f(m, |\Sigma|)$ gives the number of equivalence classes of $\equiv_m$ over $Trees(\Sigma)$. Given a $\Sigma$-tree $s$ and an element $a$ in $s$, we use $s_{\geq a}$ to denote the subtree of $s$ induced by elements $b$ that satisfy $s \models (a \leq b)$. We define $s_{\not\geq a}$ and $s_{\not> a}$ in an analogous manner. Intuitively, $s_{\geq a}$ is the subtree of $s$ rooted at $a$, $s_{\not\geq a}$ is the subtree obtained by removing the subtree rooted at $a$, and $s_{\not> a}$ is the subtree of $s$ obtained by removing all descendants of $a$. We also define the *height* of a $\Sigma$-tree to be the length of the

longest chain in the underlying poset. Furthermore, we say that a $\Sigma$-tree has degree $\leq d$ if every node (element) in the tree has $\leq d$ children. The helper lemma can now be stated as follows.

**Lemma 5.4** *Let $s$ be a $\Sigma$-tree and $W$ be a subset of elements of $s$ s.t. $|W| \leq k$. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the following hold.*

*(a) There exists a subtree $t_1$ of $s$ s.t. (i) $t_1$ contains all elements of $W$, (ii) $t_1$ has degree at most $d(m, |\Sigma|)$, and (iii) $t_1 \equiv_m s$, where $d(m,n) = (m+k) \cdot f(m,n)$ for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*(b) There exists a subtree $t_2$ of $s$ s.t. (i) $t_2$ contains all elements of $W$, (ii) $t_2$ has height at most $h(m, |\Sigma|)$, and (iii) $t_2 \equiv_m s$, where $h(m,n) = k^2 \cdot (f(m, 3f(m,n)) + 2) + f(m,n) + 1$ for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Given Lemma 5.4, it is easy to see that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a a subtree $t$ of $s$ s.t. (i) $t$ contains all elements of $W$, (ii) the size of $t$ is bounded by a computable function on $m$ and $|\Sigma|$ that uses $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ as an oracle, and (iii) $t \equiv_m s$. Since $f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is indeed a computable function, and since every subtree of $s$ is also a $\Sigma$-tree, this proves Proposition 5.3.
To prove Lemma 5.4, we need a few additional auxiliary lemmas. An easy but important one among them is the following composition lemma.

**Lemma 5.5** *Let $s_i$ be a non-empty $\Sigma$-tree containing element $a_i$, and $\mathsf{f}_i$ be a non-empty $\Sigma$-forest containing element $b_i$, for $i \in \{1,2\}$. Let $r_i = s_i \cdot_{a_i} \mathsf{f}_i$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$. Suppose $(s_1, a_1) \equiv_m (s_2, a_2)$. Then the following hold.*

1. *If $(\mathsf{f}_1, b_1) \equiv_m (\mathsf{f}_2, b_2)$, then $(r_1, a_1, b_1) \equiv_m (r_2, a_2, b_2)$. It follows that (i) $(r_1, a_1) \equiv_m (r_2, a_2)$ (ii) $(r_1, b_1) \equiv_m (r_2, b_2)$ and (iii) $r_1 \equiv_m r_2$.*
2. *If $\mathsf{f}_1 \equiv_m \mathsf{f}_2$, then $(r_1, a_1) \equiv_m (r_2, a_2)$. It follows that $r_1 \equiv_m r_2$.*

*Proof Sketch*: For part (1), the winning strategy for the duplicator in the $m$-round EF game between $(r_1, a_1, b_1)$ and $(r_2, a_2, b_2)$ is the composition of the winning strategies for the duplicator in the $m$-round games between $(s_1, a_1)$, $(s_2, a_2)$ and $(\mathsf{f}_1, b_1)$, $(\mathsf{f}_2, b_2)$. A similar argument works for part (2) as well. See Appendix F. ■
Note that composition results of this kind were first studied by Feferman and Vaught, and subsequently by others (see [8] for a survey).
Lemma 5.4(a) can now be proved as follows. *Proof*: Let $d = (m+k) \cdot f(m, |\Sigma|)$, where $m$ and $k$ are as in the statement of Lemma 5.4. For an element $a$ in $s$, let $\mathsf{Children}(a)$ denote the set of all its children in $s$. If $|\mathsf{Children}(a)| \leq d$ for every $a$ in $s$, we choose $t_1$ to be the same as $s$, and we are done. Otherwise, suppose $|\mathsf{Children}(a)| > d$. Let $W_a = \{b \in \mathsf{Children}(a) \mid s_{\geq b} \text{ contains an element of } W\}$. Observe that $|W_a| \leq k$. For every $\delta \in \Delta(m, \Sigma)$, we define the following subsets of $\mathsf{Children}(a)$:

- $C(a, \delta) = \{b \in \mathsf{Children}(a) \mid \text{ the } \equiv_m \text{ class of } s_{\geq b} \text{ is } \delta\}$.

- $D(a,\delta) = C(a,\delta)$, if $|C(a,\delta)| < m+k$; otherwise, $D(a,\delta)$ is any subset of $C(a,\delta)$ s.t. $(W_a \cap C(a,\delta)) \subseteq D(a,\delta)$ and $|D(a,\delta)| = m+k$.

It is easy to check that the forest defined by the subtrees of $s$ rooted at $C(a,\delta)$ is $m$-equivalent to the forest defined by the subtrees rooted at $D(a,\delta)$. Formally, if $\mathsf{f}_\delta = \bigsqcup_{b\in C(a,\delta)} s_{\geq b}$ and $\mathsf{g}_\delta = \bigsqcup_{b\in D(a,\delta)} s_{\geq b}$, then $\mathsf{f}_\delta \equiv_m \mathsf{g}_\delta$. Therefore, if $\mathsf{f} = \bigsqcup_{\delta\in\Delta(m,\Sigma)} \mathsf{f}_\delta$ and $\mathsf{g} = \bigsqcup_{\delta\in\Delta(m,\Sigma)} \mathsf{g}_\delta$, we have $\mathsf{f} \equiv_m \mathsf{g}$. By Lemma 5.5, $s = \left(s_{\not> a} \cdot_a \mathsf{f}\right) \equiv_m \left(s_{\not> a} \cdot_a \mathsf{g}\right) = s_1$, say. Thus $s_1$ contains $W$ and the element $a$ has at most $d$ children in $s_1$. The count of elements in $s_1$ having $> d$ children is therefore strictly less than the corresponding number in $s$. Since $s$ has finitely many elements, by repeating the above argument, we obtain a subtree $t_1$ of $s$, as required in Lemma 5.4(a). ■

To prove Lemma 5.4(b), we need a few additional auxiliary lemmas. As before, let $s$ denote a tree, and $W$ denote a subset of elements in $s$. Given nodes (elements) $a, b \in W$, we say that $b$ is *consecutive* to node $a$ w.r.t. $W$ in $s$ if the underlying poset is such that $a < b$ and $a < w < b$ does not hold for any $w \in W$. Furthermore, we use $d_s(a,b)$ to denote the length of the path between $a$ and $b$ in the Hasse diagram of the poset underlying $s$. The additional auxiliary lemmas can now be stated as follows.

**Lemma 5.6** *Let $s$ be a $\Sigma$-tree. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a subtree $t$ of $s$ s.t. (i) the height of $t$ is at most $f(m,|\Sigma|)$ and (ii) $t \equiv_m s$.*

**Lemma 5.7** *Let $s$ be a $\Sigma$-tree, $a$ be the root of $s$ and $b$ be any node (element) of $s$. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a subtree $t$ of $s$ containing $a$ and $b$ such that (i) $d_t(a,b) \leq f(m, 3\cdot f(m,|\Sigma|))$ and (ii) $(t,b) \equiv_m (s,b)$.*

***Lemma 5.8*** *Let $s$ be a $\Sigma$-tree and $W$ be a subset of nodes (elements) such that $|W| \leq k$. Let $a, b \in W$ be s.t. $b$ is consecutive to $a$ w.r.t. $W$ in $s$. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a subtree $t$ of $s$ s.t. (i) $t$ contains $W$ (ii) $t \equiv_m s$, (iii) $b$ is consecutive to $a$ w.r.t. $W$ in $t$, and (iv) $d_t(a,b) \leq (k-1)\cdot(f(m,3\cdot f(m,|\Sigma|))+2)$.*

Given these auxiliary lemmas, Lemma 5.4(b) can be proved as follows. For notational clarity, define $N_1 = k\cdot(f(m,3\cdot f(m,|\Sigma|))+2)$, $N_2 = k\cdot N_1$, $N_3 = f(m,|\Sigma|)$ and $N_4 = N_2 + N_3 + 1$. Let us further define $W_1 = \{root_s\} \cup W$. By repeatedly applying Lemma 5.8 with $W_1$ in place of $W$, we first obtain a subtree $z$ of $s$ s.t. (i) $z$ contains $W_1$, (ii) $z \equiv_m s$, (iii) $root_z = root_s$, and (iii) $d_z(root_z, a) \leq N_2$, for each element $a$ of $W$. By repeatedly applying Lemma 5.6 to the subtrees rooted at elements $b$ s.t $d_z(root_z, b) = N_2 + 1$ and using Lemma 5.5, we obtain a subtree $t$ of $z$ s.t. (i) $t$ contains $W_1$ (ii) $t \equiv_m z$ and (iii) $t$ has height at most $N_4$. This proves Lemma 5.4(b).

We now turn to proving the last three auxiliary lemmas referred to above. Lemma 5.6 is the easiest to prove. Let $A$ be the underlying set of $s$. Define the function $g : A \to \Delta(m,\Sigma)$ as follows. For $a \in A$, $g(a)$ is the $\equiv_m$ class of $s_{\geq a}$. If no two elements in any path in $s$ have the same $g$ value, then the height of $s$ is at most $f(m,|\Sigma|)$, and the subtree $t$ required in Lemma 5.6 can be chosen to be $s$ itself. Otherwise, there exist $a, b \in A$ s.t. (i) $s \models (a \leq b)$ and (ii) $g(a) = g(b)$.

If $a$ is the root of $s$, then let $s_1 = s_{\geq b}$ and we repeat the reasoning of this proof with $s_1$ in place of $s$ (since $s_1 \equiv_m s$). Otherwise, let $c$ be the parent of $a$ in $s$. By Lemma 5.5, $s = \left(s_{\not\geq a} \cdot_c s_{\geq a}\right) \equiv_m \left(s_{\not\geq a} \cdot_c s_{\geq b}\right)$. Let $s_1$ denote $\left(s_{\not\geq a} \cdot_c s_{\geq b}\right)$. Then $s_1$ is a subtree of $s$ and has fewer elements than $s$. We now repeat the same reasoning as above with $s_1$ in place of $s$. Since $s$ has only finitely many elements, this process terminates with the desired subtree $t$ of $s$. ■

The following is an easy corollary of Lemma 5.6.

**Corollary 5.9** *Let $w$ be a given word over $\Sigma$. Then given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a subword $v$ of $w$ s.t. (i) $|v| \leq f(m, |\Sigma|)$ and (ii) $v \equiv_m w$.*

Our proof of Lemma 5.7 is inspired by the technique of companion models described in [1]. Recall that $a$ is the root of a $\Sigma$-tree $s$ and $b$ is an arbitrary node in $s$ in Lemma5.7. For notational clarity, let $q = f(m, 3 \cdot f(m, |\Sigma|))$. If $d_s(a, b) \leq q$, we choose $t = s$, and we are done. Otherwise, suppose $d_s(a, b) = n > q$. For $i \in \{0, n\}$, let $c_i$ be the $i^{th}$ node along the (unique) path between $a$ and $b$. Therefore, $c_0 = a$, $c_n = b$ and $d_s(a, c_i) = i$. Let the subtree rooted at $c_i$ be denoted $t_i$, i.e. $t_i = s_{\geq c_i}$. Let $z_0, z_1, \ldots z_n$ be a sequence of subtrees of $s$ defined as follows: (i) for $i \in \{0, \ldots n-1\}$, $z_i = (t_i)_{\not\geq c_{i+1}}$, i.e. the subtree of $t_i$ obtained after removing the subtree $t_{i+1}$, and (ii) $z_n = t_n$. It is easy to see that $s$ can be represented as $(((z_0 \cdot_a z_1) \cdot_{c_1} z_2) \ldots \cdot_{c_{n-1}} z_n)$. We now construct an $(n+1)$-length word $w$ over the vocabulary $\Delta(m, \Sigma) \times \{0, 1, 2\}$ as follows: (i) $w[1] = (\delta, 1)$, where $\delta$ is the $\equiv_m$ class of $z_0$, (ii) for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, $w[i] = (\delta, 0)$, where $\delta$ is the $\equiv_m$ class of $z_i$, and (iii) $w[n+1] = (\delta, 2)$, where $\delta$ is the $\equiv_m$ class of $z_n$. By Corollary 5.9, there is a subword $w_1$ of $w$ s.t. (i) $|w_1| \leq q$, and (ii) $w_1 \equiv_m w$. Let the length of $w_1$ be $l + 2$. Observe that $w_1$ must contain $w[1]$ and $w[n + 1]$. Since $w_1$ is a subword of $w$, there exist positions $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_l, i_{l+1}$ of $w$ s.t $i_0 = 1, i_{l+1} = n+1$ and $i_0 < \ldots < i_{l+1}$, and $w_1[j + 1] = w[i_j]$ for $j \in \{0, \ldots l + 1\}$. Now consider the subtree $t$ defined by $(((z_0 \cdot_a z_{i_1}) \cdot_{c_{i_1}} z_{i_2}) \ldots \cdot_{c_{i_l}} z_{n+1})$. Observe that $t$ contains $a$ and $b$ and $d_t(a, b) = |w_1| - 1 < q$. It is easy to see that $(t, b) \equiv_m (s, b)$ (by similar arguments as in [1]). ■

Finally, Lemma 5.8 is proved as follows. Recall that $s$ is a $\Sigma$-tree, $W$ is subset of at most $k$ nodes of $s$, and $a, b \in W$ are s.t. $b$ is consecutive to $a$ w.r.t $W$ in $s$. For notational clarity, let $N_1 = f(m, 3 \cdot f(m, |\Sigma|))$ and $r = (k - 1) \cdot (N_1 + 2)$. If $d_s(a, b) \leq r$, we choose $t = s$, and we are done. Otherwise, we show that there exists a subtree $s'$ of $s$ s.t. (i) $s'$ contains $W$ (ii) $s' \equiv_m s$, (iii) $b$ is consecutive to $a$ w.r.t. $W$ in $s'$ and (iv) $d_{s'}(a, b) < d_s(a, b)$. Lemma 5.8 then follows by recursively applying the same reasoning to $s'$.

We reuse the notation $c_i$ and $z_i$ introduced in the proof of Lemma 5.7, but we no longer require $a$ to be the root of $s$. Let $I \subseteq \{0, \ldots, n\}$ be the set of all indices $i$ such that $z_i$ contains an element of $W$. Clearly $0, n \in I$. Since $|W| \leq k$, we have $|I| \leq k$. If $|j - i| \leq (N_1 + 2)$ for every pair of consecutive indices $i, j$ in $I$, then $d_s(a, b) \leq (k - 1) \cdot (N_1 + 2) = r$. However, this violates our assumption $d_s(a, b) > r$. Therefore, there exist consecutive indices $i', j' \in I$ s.t. $i' < j'$ and $|j' - i'| > N_1 + 2$. Let $i = i' + 1$ and $j = j' - 1$. Consider the subtree $z$ obtained by removing the subtree $s_{\geq c_{j'}}$ from $s_{\geq c_i}$. The following hold for $z$: (i) $c_i$ is the

root of $z$, (ii) $c_j \in z$, and (iii) $z$ does not contain any element of $W$. Applying Lemma 5.7 with $z$, $c_i$ and $c_j$ as inputs, we know that there exists a subtree $y$ of $z$ containing $c_i$ and $c_j$ such that (i) $d_y(c_i, c_j) \leq N_1$ and (ii) $(y, c_j) \equiv_m (z, c_j)$. It is also easy to see that $s_{\geq c_i} = z \cdot_{c_j} s_{\geq c_{j'}}$. Since $(y, c_j) \equiv_m (z, c_j)$, by Lemma 5.5, we have $s_{\geq c_i} \equiv_m (y \cdot_{c_j} s_{\geq c_{j'}})$. Let $y_1$ denote $y \cdot_{c_j} s_{\geq c_{j'}}$ and let $y_2$ denote the subtree obtained by removing $s_{\geq c_i}$ from $s$. Applying Lemma 5.5 again, we get $\big(y_2 \cdot_{c_{i'}} s_{\geq c_i}\big) \equiv_m \big(y_2 \cdot_{c_{i'}} y_1\big)$. Note that $s = y_2 \cdot_{c_{i'}} s_{\geq c_i}$. Then the subtree $y_2 \cdot_{c_{i'}} y_1$ serves as the $s'$ required at the end of the previous paragraph. ■

**Remark**: Let $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{MSO}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ be the property obtained by replacing $\equiv_m$ in the definition of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ with $\equiv^{MSO}_m$, where $\mathfrak{A} \equiv^{MSO}_m \mathfrak{B}$ denotes that $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ agree on all MSO sentences of total rank (i.e. first order and second order quantifiers) $m$. The same ideas as in the proofs above show that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{MSO}(Trees(\Sigma), k)$ (and hence, $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{MSO}(Words(\Sigma), k)$ hold for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

# 6 Generating new classes of structures

We consider two natural ways of generating new classes of structures from a base class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures. The primary result of this section is that classes generated by these techniques inherit the $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ properties of the base classes. For technical reasons, we assume in this section that $\tau$ has only predicate symbols (i.e. no constant symbols).

## 6.1 Using unary/binary operations on structures

We focus on disjoint union ($\sqcup$), complementation (!), cartesian product ($\times$) and tensor product ($\otimes$) on $\tau$-structures in a base class $\mathcal{S}$. The definitions of $\sqcup$ and $\times$ are standard (see [8] and Appendix G). The definitions of ! and $\otimes$ below are inspired by their definitions in the context of graphs. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ be $\tau$-structures.

- The *complement* of $\mathfrak{A}$, denoted $!\mathfrak{A}$, is defined as follows: (i) $\mathsf{U}_{!\mathfrak{A}} = \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, and (ii) for every $n$-ary predicate $R$ in $\tau$, for every $n$-tuple $(a_1, \ldots a_n) \in \mathsf{U}^n_{\mathcal{A}}$, $!\mathfrak{A} \models R(a_1, \ldots a_n)$ iff $\mathfrak{A} \not\models R(a_1, \ldots a_n)$.
- The *tensor product* of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, denoted $\mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathfrak{B}$, is the structure $\mathfrak{C}$ defined as follows: (i) $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{C}} = \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}} \times \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, and (ii) for each $n$-ary predicate $R$ in $\tau$, for each $n$-tuple $\big((a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_n, b_n)\big)$ of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{C}}$, we have $\mathfrak{C} \models R\big(((a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_n, b_n))\big)$ iff $\mathfrak{A} \models R(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ *and* $\mathfrak{B} \models R(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$.

We list below examples of classes of structures that can be generated by applying the above operations repeatedly on simple classes of structures. In all these examples, colours are assumed to come from a finite set of colours.

1. The class of coloured graphs, where the edge relation of each graph represents an equivalence relation.
2. The class of coloured co-graphs.

3. The class of $r$-dimensional *grids* for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$, where a *grid* is a tensor product of linear orders.

Let $\mathsf{Op} = \{\sqcup, !, \times, \otimes\}$. The following properties of operations in $\mathsf{Op}$ are used crucially in subsequent proofs. The properties are easy to prove, and the proofs are omitted for lack of space. Let $\circledast$ be a binary operation in $\mathsf{Op}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

P1) If $\mathfrak{A}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{A}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_2$, then (i) $!\mathfrak{A}_1 \subseteq !\mathfrak{B}_1$ and (ii) $(\mathfrak{A}_1 \circledast \mathfrak{A}_2) \subseteq (\mathfrak{B}_1 \circledast \mathfrak{B}_2)$.

P2) If $\mathfrak{A}_1 \equiv_m \mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{A}_2 \equiv_m \mathfrak{B}_2$, then (i) $!\mathfrak{A}_1 \equiv_m !\mathfrak{B}_1$ and (ii) $(\mathfrak{A}_1 \circledast \mathfrak{A}_2) \equiv_m (\mathfrak{B}_1 \circledast \mathfrak{B}_2)$.

Given a class $\mathcal{S}$, let $!\mathcal{S}$ denote the class $\{!\mathfrak{A} \mid \mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Given classes $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ and a binary operation $\circledast \in \mathsf{Op}$, let $\mathcal{S}_1 \circledast \mathcal{S}_2$ denote the class $\{\mathfrak{A} \circledast \mathfrak{B} \mid \mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_1, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}_2\}$. Using the above properties, we can now show the following. The proofs are deferred to Appendix H.

**Lemma 6.1** *Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ be classes of structures. Let $\circledast$ be a binary operation in $\mathsf{Op}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

1. *If $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_i, k)$ holds for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, each of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(!\mathcal{S}_i, k)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_1 \circledast \mathcal{S}_2, k)$ holds.*
2. *If $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}_i, k)$ holds for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, each of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(!\mathcal{S}_i, k)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}_1 \circledast \mathcal{S}_2, k)$ holds.*

Given $O \subseteq \mathsf{Op}$, define an *operation tree over $O$* to be a finite rooted tree[2] whose leaf nodes are unlabelled and non-leaf nodes are labelled with elements of $O$. Furthermore, if the label of a non-leaf node is *op*, the number of its successors equals the arity of *op*. An operation tree takes structures as "inputs" at its leaf nodes and produces an "output" structure at its root in the natural way. We say that the output structure is produced by "applying" the operation tree to its inputs.

Given a class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures satisfying $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$), it follows from Lemma 6.1 that the class $\mathcal{S}'$ of structures obtained by applying any fixed operation tree to the structures of $\mathcal{S}$, also satisfies $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}', k)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}', k)$). The same holds if $\mathcal{S}'$ is the union of the classes of structures obtained by applying operation trees of height at most $h$ (for a fixed $h$) to the structures in $\mathcal{S}$, where $h \in \mathbb{N}$. However, there are interesting classes of structures that can be generated only by applying operation trees of arbitrary heights. For example, the class of all co-graphs is produced from the class of single vertex graphs by applying all operation trees over $\{\sqcup, !\}$. What can we then say about properties of such classes? We present below a technique to address this question.

Given a class $\mathcal{S}$ of structures and $O \subseteq \mathsf{Op}$, an *expression tree over* $(\mathcal{S}, O)$ is an operation tree over $O$ whose leaf nodes have been labelled with specific structures from $\mathcal{S}$. If $s$ is an expression tree over $(\mathcal{S}, O)$, let $\mathfrak{C}_s$ denote the

[2]We think of a tree in the poset-theoretic sense, as in Section 5.

structure represented by $s$ upto isomorphism. Given a node $a \in s$, we denote the subtree of $s$ rooted at $a$ as $s_a$. We denote by $Z_{\mathcal{S},O}$ the class of all structures defined by all possible expression trees over $(\mathcal{S}, O)$.

**Theorem 6.2** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a given class of structures and let $O = \{\sqcup, !\}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

1. *if $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, so does $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(Z_{\mathcal{S},O}, k)$.*
2. *if $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, so does $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Z_{\mathcal{S},O}, k)$.*

*Proof*: W.l.o.g., assume that $\mathcal{S} = !\mathcal{S}$. For otherwise, we work with the union of $\mathcal{S}$ and $!\mathcal{S}$ since (i) $Z_{\mathcal{S},O} = Z_{\mathcal{S}\cup!\mathcal{S},O}$ and (ii) $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ implies $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}\cup!\mathcal{S}, k)$ (likewise for $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}$).
As the first step, we introduce a new operation $\bowtie$ defined as follows. Given structures $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{A} \bowtie \mathfrak{B} = !((!\mathfrak{A}) \sqcup (!\mathfrak{B}))$. The reader can verify that $\bowtie$ enjoys properties P1 and P2 mentioned earlier. Let $O_1 = \{\sqcup, \bowtie\}$. An additional important property, call it P3, of $\circledast \in O_1$ is that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{A} \circledast \mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A} \circledast \mathfrak{B}$. Given $\mathfrak{A} \in Z_{\mathcal{S},O}$, let $s'$ be an expression tree over $(\mathcal{S}, O)$ s.t. $\mathfrak{C}_{s'} = \mathfrak{A}$. Using the facts that $!(!\mathfrak{A}) = \mathfrak{A}$ and $!(\mathfrak{A} \sqcup \mathfrak{B}) = ((!\mathfrak{A}) \bowtie (!\mathfrak{B}))$, we can 'push' the ! operator down to the leaves to get an expression tree $s$ over $(\mathcal{S}, O_1)$ s.t. $\mathfrak{C}_s = \mathfrak{A}$.
To prove part (1) of the theorem, we use the notation $\mathcal{S}^k$ introduced in Lemma 5.2. We show that if $Y = Z_{\mathcal{S},O}$, then $Y^k$ is a w.q.o. under the embedding relation. Let $(\mathfrak{A}_1, P_1), (\mathfrak{A}_2, P_2), \ldots$ be an infinite sequence of structures from $Y^k$, where each $P_i$ is an atmost $k$-sized subset of $U_{\mathfrak{A}_i}$. Let $s_i$ be an expression tree over $(\mathcal{S}, O_1)$ s.t. $\mathfrak{C}_{s_i} = \mathfrak{A}_i$. Since only $\sqcup$ and $\bowtie$ are used as labels of the non-leaf nodes in $s_i$, every element of $P_i$ belongs to exactly one structure fed as input at a leaf of $s_i$. Let $t_i$ be the expression tree over $(\mathcal{S}^k, O_1)$ s.t. $\mathfrak{C}_{t_i} = (\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)$. Let $\hookrightarrow$ be the embedding relation over $\mathcal{S}^k$ and let $\ll$ be the relation over $\mathcal{S}^k \cup O_1$ defined as $\ll = \hookrightarrow \cup \{(\circledast, \circledast) | \circledast \in O_1\}$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ holds, $\mathcal{S}^k \cup O_1$ is a w.q.o. under $\ll$. Applying Kruskal's tree theorem to $(t_i)_{i\geq 1}$, there exists $t_i, t_j$, where $i < j$ and a subtree $t'_j$ of $t_j$ exists s.t. (i) the operation trees corresponding to $t_i$ and $t'_j$ are identical and (ii) if $\mathfrak{B}^i_1, \ldots \mathfrak{B}^i_l$ are the leaves of $t_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}^j_1 \ldots \mathfrak{B}^j_l$ are the corresponding leaves of $t'_j$, then $\mathfrak{B}^i_1 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}^j_1, \ldots \mathfrak{B}^i_l \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}^j_l$. Using properties P1 and P3 of $\sqcup$ and $\bowtie$, it is easy to see that $M_{t_i}$ embeds into $M_{t'_j}$, and hence into $M_{t_j}$.
2) We now show that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Z_{\mathcal{S},O}, k)$ holds. Let the vocabulary of structures be $\tau$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Let $\Delta_m$ be the set of all the equivalence classes of the $\equiv_m$ relation over the class of all $\tau$-structures and let $f(m) = |\Delta_m|$. Consider $\mathfrak{A} \in Z_{\mathcal{S},O}$ and suppose that $s$ is an expression tree over $(\mathcal{S}, O_1)$ s.t. $\mathfrak{C}_s = \mathfrak{A}$. Let $W$ be a set of $\leq k$ elements from $\mathfrak{A}$. We observe that for $l \leq k$, the set $W$ identifies structures $\mathfrak{B}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{B}_l$ at the leaves of $s$, such that all the elements of $W$ can be located inside these structures. We organize our proof in two parts: (I) We first show that there exists a sub-expression-tree $t$ of $s$, of height at most $h = k \times f(m)$, s.t. (i) $\mathfrak{B}_j$ is a leaf of $t$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, (ii) $\mathfrak{C}_t \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and (ii) $\mathfrak{C}_t \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$. (II) We create a tree $t_1$ from $t$ by replacing the leaves of $t$ with bounded sized $m$-equivalent substructures ensuring that $\mathfrak{C}_{t_1}$ contains $W$. We

then show that $\mathfrak{C}_{t_1}$ is the desired bounded sized $m$-equivalent substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$, to complete the proof.
(I) Our approach for height reduction is similar to the one used in the proof of Lemma 5.6. Let $A$ be the set of all nodes (internal + leaf) of $s$. Define the function $g : A \to \Delta_m \times \{1, \ldots, k\}$ as: for $a \in A$, $g(a) = (\delta, i)$ where (i) $\delta$ is the $\equiv_m$ class of $\mathfrak{C}_{s_a}$ where $s_a$ is the subtree of $s$ rooted at $a$ (ii) the number of leaves in $s_a$ that contain any element of $W$, is exactly $i$. Now if no two elements in any path in $s$ have the same $g$ value, then the height of $s$ is at most $h$, whence $t$ can be taken to be $s$ itself. Else there exist elements $a, b \in A$ s.t. $b \in s_a$ and $g(a) = g(b)$. If $a$ is the root of $s$, then let $s_1 = s_b$. Else, let $c$ be the parent of $a$ in $s$ and let $s_1$ be the subtree of $s$ obtained by deleting $s_a$ and joining $s_b$ to $c$ (i.e. by making $c$ the parent of $b$). In either case, the following are true about $s_1$: (i) All of the $\mathfrak{B}_j$s are present as leaves of $s_1$ — since $g(a) = g(b)$, it means that all the leaves of $s_a$ that contain elements of $W$ are also leaves of $s_b$. (ii) $\mathfrak{C}_s \equiv_m \mathfrak{C}_{s_1}$ — If $s_1 = s_b$ above, then $\mathfrak{C}_s = \mathfrak{C}_{s_a} \equiv_m \mathfrak{C}_{s_b} = \mathfrak{C}_{s_1}$. Else since the tree obtained by deleting $s_a$ from $s$ is the same as the tree obtained by deleting $s_b$ from $s_1$, we have by the property P2 of $\sqcup$ and $\bowtie$ that $\mathfrak{C}_s \equiv_m \mathfrak{C}_{s_1}$ (iii) $\mathfrak{C}_{s_1} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_s$ – this is because $\mathfrak{C}_{s_b} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_{s_a}$ due to property P3 mentioned above and because $\sqcup$ and $\bowtie$ have property P1. We now repeat all of the argument above with $s_1$ in place of $s$. It is clear that continuing this way, we get the desired subtree $t$ of $s$.
(II) Let $\alpha$ be the computable function witnessing $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. Since each leaf $\mathfrak{B}$ of $t$ is also a leaf of $s$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$. Then for each leaf $\mathfrak{B}$, by the definition of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$, there exists a substructure $\mathfrak{B}^1$ of $\mathfrak{B}$ of size $\leq \alpha(m)$, s.t. $\mathfrak{B}^1 \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathfrak{B}^1 \equiv_m \mathfrak{B}$ and all the elements of $W$ contained in $\mathfrak{B}$ are also contained in $\mathfrak{B}^1$. Let $t_1$ be the tree obtained by replacing each leaf $\mathfrak{B}$ of $t$ with $\mathfrak{B}^1$. Then $t_1$ has the following properties: (i) $\mathfrak{C}_{t_1}$ contains $W$ (ii) $|\mathfrak{C}_{t_1}| \leq 2^h \times \alpha(m)$ (iii) $\mathfrak{C}_{t_1} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_t$ (by property P1) (iv) $\mathfrak{C}_{t_1} \equiv_m \mathfrak{C}_t$ (by property P2) and (v) $\mathfrak{C}_{t_1} \in Z_{\mathcal{S},O}$, because by expressing the $\bowtie$ operator in terms of $\sqcup$ and ! as in its definition, we get an expression tree $t'$ over $(\mathcal{S}, O)$ s.t. $\mathfrak{C}_{t'} = \mathfrak{C}_{t_1}$.
Combining (I) and (II) above, we get that $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Z_{\mathcal{S},O}, k)$ holds, where the witnessing computable function is $\beta(m) = 2^{(k \cdot f(m))} \times \alpha(m)$. ■
We do not know whether Theorem 6.2 holds for all $k$ if we consider $O = \mathsf{Op}$ in its statement. However, for $k = 0$ or 1, this result does go through. We skip the proof in this paper.

## 6.2 Constructing words and trees over classes of structures

Given a class $\mathcal{S}$ of $\tau$-structures, we now define the classes $Words(\mathcal{S})$, resp. $Trees(\mathcal{S})$, which intuitively speaking, are the classes of words, resp. trees, of structures in $\mathcal{S}$.
Formally, a *word over* $\mathcal{S}$, or simply, a $\mathcal{S}$-word, is a finite sequence of structures from $\mathcal{S}$. A $\mathcal{S}$-word $w = \mathfrak{A}_1 \cdot \mathfrak{A}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{A}_n$ has a natural representation as a $\nu$-structure $\mathfrak{B}$, where $\nu = \{\leq\} \cup \tau$: (i) $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{i=n} \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_i}$ (ii) the $\tau$-reduct of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_i})$ is exactly $\mathfrak{A}_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ (iii) for each predicate $R \in \tau$, of arity $k$, if $\bar{a}$ is a

$k$-tuple from $U_{\mathfrak{B}}$ having at least two components from two different $U_{\mathfrak{A}_i}$s, then $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R(\bar{a})$ (iv) $\mathfrak{B} \models (a \leq b)$ for all $a \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_i}$ and $b \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg(b \leq a)$ for all $a \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_i}$ and $b \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}_j}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Then $Words(\mathcal{S})$ is just the class of all $\mathcal{S}$-words. The formal definition of $Trees(\mathcal{S})$ is similar.
Given two $\mathcal{S}$-words $w_1$ and $w_2$ s.t. $w_1 = \mathfrak{A}_1 \cdot \mathfrak{A}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{A}_r$, it is easy to check given the definitions above, that $w_1$ is embeddable in $w_2$ iff there exists a sub-$\mathcal{S}$-word $\mathfrak{B}_1 \cdot \mathfrak{B}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{B}_r$ of $w_2$ such that $\mathfrak{A}_i$ embeds into $\mathfrak{B}_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. We now show the following.

**Proposition 6.3** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a given class of structures. Then given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the following are true.*

1. $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{wqo}(Words(\mathcal{S}), k)$.
2. $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{wqo}(Trees(\mathcal{S}), k)$.

*Proof*: We firstly observe that each of the above statements for $k = 0$ follows straightaway from Higman's lemma and Kruskal's tree theorem. For $k > 0$, we show the result for $Words(\mathcal{S})$. The proof for $Trees(\mathcal{S})$ is similar. Let $Y = Words(\mathcal{S})$. Consider an infinite sequence $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)_{i \geq 1}$ from $Y^k$. For each $i$, the elements of $P_i$ can be located within the structures forming $\mathfrak{A}_i$. Specifically, if $\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{A}_i^1 \cdots \mathfrak{A}_i^n$, then for $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, there exist subsets $P_i^j$ of elements of $\mathfrak{A}_i^j$ s.t. $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i) = (\mathfrak{A}_i^1, P_i^1) \cdots (\mathfrak{A}_i^n, P_i^n) \in Words(\mathcal{S}^k)$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}^k, 0)$, we have $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(Words(\mathcal{S}^k), 0)$. Whence there exist $i, j$ where $i < j$ s.t. if $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i) = (\mathfrak{A}_i^1, P_i^1) \cdots (\mathfrak{A}_i^n, P_i^n)$, then there is a sub-$\mathcal{S}^k$-word $(\mathfrak{B}_j^1, P_j^1) \cdots (\mathfrak{B}_j^n, P_j^n)$ of $(\mathfrak{A}_j, P_j)$ such that $(\mathfrak{A}_i^l, P_i^l)$ embeds into $(\mathfrak{B}_j^l, P_j^l)$ for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)$ embeds into $(\mathfrak{A}_j, P_j)$. ■

**Proposition 6.4** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a given class of structures. Then given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the following are true.*

1. $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Words(\mathcal{S}), k)$.
2. $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(Trees(\mathcal{S}), k)$.

*Proof*: We show the result for $Words(\mathcal{S})$. The proof for $Trees(\mathcal{S})$ is similar. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Consider $\mathfrak{A} \in Words(\mathcal{S})$ s.t. $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{A}_r$. Let $W$ be a set of at most $k$ elements of $\mathfrak{A}$. Let $W_i$ be the set of elements of $W$ that are contained in $\mathfrak{A}_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. Let $\alpha$ be the computable function witnessing $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$, since $\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $\mathfrak{B}_i \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_i$ s.t. (i) $\mathfrak{B}_i \in \mathcal{S}$ (ii) $\mathfrak{B}_i$ contains $W_i$ (ii) $|\mathfrak{B}_i| \leq \alpha(m)$ (iii) $\mathfrak{B}_i \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}_i$. Then consider the $\mathcal{S}$-word $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{B}_r$. It is easy to see that (i) $\mathfrak{B} \in Words(\mathcal{S})$ (ii) $\mathfrak{B}$ contains $W$ (iii) $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and (iv) $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$.
Since each $\mathfrak{B}_i$ has size at most $\alpha(m)$, $\mathfrak{B}$ can be treated as a word $u$ over a finite alphabet $\Sigma_m$, where $\Sigma_m$ is the set of all $\tau$-structures (upto isomorphism) of size at most $\alpha(m)$. Note that there exists a computable function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $|\Sigma_m| = \beta(m)$. Let $W^1 = \{i \mid \mathfrak{B}_i \text{ contains at least one element of } W_i\}$. Clearly $|W^1| \leq k$. Then by Proposition 5.3, there exists a subword $v$ of $u$ containing

$W^1$ such that $v \equiv_m u$ and $|v| \leq \gamma(m, |\Sigma_m|)$ for some computable function $\gamma$. If $v = u\,[i_1] \cdots u\,[i_l]$, then consider the $\mathcal{S}$-word $\mathfrak{B}^1 = \mathfrak{B}_{i_1} \cdots \mathfrak{B}_{i_l}$. It is easy to show that $\mathfrak{B}^1 \equiv_m \mathfrak{B}$. Further, we see that (i) $\mathfrak{B}^1$ contains $W$ (ii) $\mathfrak{B}^1 \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$ (iii) $\mathfrak{B}^1 \in Words(\mathcal{S})$ (iv) $|\mathfrak{B}^1| \leq \alpha(m) \times \gamma(m, \beta(m))$. ■

Two examples of classes of structures that can be generated using the above operations are the class of all coloured total pre-orders and the class of all coloured pre-order trees.

# 7 Conclusion

We studied two abstract properties of classes of finite structures that allow a generalization of the classical Łoś-Tarski theorem to hold. This augments earlier work on identifying properties of classes of finite structures that allow the Łoś-Tarski theorem to hold. We showed that several interesting classes of finite structures satisfy the properties discussed in this paper, and even allow an effective translation of a sentence in $PSC(k)$ to an equivalent $\exists^k\forall^*$ sentence. Nevertheless, several questions remain open. For example, while we have shown that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ implies $\mathbb{PSC}(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$, we do not know yet whether the implication is strict. Similarly, all properties studied in this paper lead to cores being definable by a relativized formula. We would like to study more closely the relationship between $PSC(k) = \exists^k\forall^*$ and definability of cores, not necessarily by relativized formulae.

# Acknowledgment

The authors thank Ajit A. Diwan for insightful discussions.

# References

[1] A. Atserias, A. Dawar, and M. Grohe. Preservation under extensions on well-behaved finite structures. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(4):1364–1381, 2008.

[2] A. Atserias, A. Dawar, and P. G. Kolaitis. On preservation under homomorphisms and unions of conjunctive queries. *J. ACM*, 53(2):208–237, 2006.

[3] C. C. Chang and H. J. Keisler. *Model Theory*. Elsevier Science Publishers, 3 edition, 1990.

[4] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer, 2010.

[5] David Duris. Extension preservation theorems on classes of acyclic finite structures. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(8):3670–3681, 2010.

[6] H. Ebbinghaus and J. Flum. *Finite Model Theory*. Springer, 2005.

[7] L. Libkin. *Elements of Finite Model Theory*. Springer, 2004.

[8] Johann A. Makowsky. Algorithmic uses of the feferman-vaught theorem. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 126(1-3):159–213, 2004.

[9] B. Rossman. Homomorphism preservation theorems. *J. ACM*, 55(3), 2008.

[10] A. Sankaran, B. Adsul, and S. Chakraborty. Generalizations of the łoś-tarski preservation theorem. *CoRR*, abs/1302.4350, 2013.

[11] A. Sankaran, B. Adsul, V. Madan, P. Kamath, and S. Chakraborty. Preservation under substructures modulo bounded cores. In *proceedings of WoLLIC*, pages 291–305, 2012.

# A Proof of Lemma 3.3

All the arguments below are over $\mathcal{S}$.
Suppose $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ holds. Let $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{PS}$. Then the complement $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ is preserved under extensions. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the class of minimal models of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is finite upto isomorphism, then taking the disjunction of the existential closures of the 'atomic diagrams' of the models of $\mathcal{H}$, we get a $\exists^*$ sentence $\psi$ defining $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Then $\neg\psi$ defines $\mathcal{C}$. We show that $\mathcal{H}$ must always be finite. For if not, then let $(\mathfrak{A}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence of structures from $\mathcal{H}$ where the $\mathfrak{A}_i$ are all distinct. Since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, 0)$ holds, we have for some $i, j$ s.t. $i < j$, that $\mathfrak{A}_i \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}_j$. But this violates the minimality of $\mathfrak{A}_j$.
Suppose $\mathbb{PS} \equiv \forall^*$. Let $(\mathfrak{A}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence of structures from $\mathcal{S}$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S} \mid \mathfrak{A}_i \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B} \text{ for some } i \geq 1\}$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is preserved under extensions, whence $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{PS}$. By assumption then, there exists a $\forall^*$ sentence $\psi$ defining $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is defined by an $\exists^*$ sentence, namely $\neg\psi$. Then the number of minimal models of $\mathcal{C}$ is finite. But the minimal models of $\mathcal{C}$ are exactly the $\mathfrak{A}_i$s. Clearly then for some $i, j$ s.t. $i < j$, we have $\mathfrak{A}_i \cong \mathfrak{A}_j$. ■

# B Witness function for $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ lies in the second level of the Turing heirarchy

To see why this is so, note that we can construct a Turing machine $TM_{\mathcal{S}}$ that accepts $m$, $k$, $p$ as inputs, recursively enumerates $S$ and halts only if it finds a structure $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ and a subset $W$ of $U_{\mathfrak{A}}$ of size $\leq k$, such that no substructure $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$, sized $p$ or less, satisfies the conditions of Definition 3.5. Using an oracle that answers whether $TM_{\mathcal{S}}(m, k, p)$ halts, we can now construct a Turing machine that accepts $m, k$ as inputs, enumerates values of $p$, and outputs the first $p$ for which $TM_{\mathcal{S}}(m, k, p)$ doesn't halt.

# C Proof of Proposition 4.3

Let $C_n$, resp. $P_n$, denote an undirected cycle, resp. path, of length $n$. Let $mP_n$ denote the disjoint union of $m$ copies of $P_n$. Let $H_n = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{i=3^n} nP_i$ and $G_n = C_{3^n} \sqcup H_n$, where $\bigsqcup$ and $\sqcup$ denote disjoint union. Then consider the class $\mathcal{S}$ of undirected graphs given by $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$, where $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{H_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{G_n \mid n \geq 1\}$. We will show that $\mathcal{S} \in \Gamma^*_{comp} \setminus \Gamma^0_{wqo}$.
The fact that $\mathcal{S}$ is not in $\Gamma^0_{wqo}$ is easy to see. Consider the sequence $(G_n)_{n\geq 1}$. The cycles in these graphs prevent any $G_m$ from being embeddable in any $G_n$ for $m \neq n$.
We now show $\mathcal{S} \in \Gamma^*_{comp}$ by showing that given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ defined as $f(m) = |G_{m+k+2}|$ witnesses $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. Towards this, we will first need some basic facts about $C_n$, $P_n$, $H_n$ and $G_n$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be given.

1. If $n_1, n_2 \geq 3^m$, then $P_{n_1} \equiv_m P_{n_2}$.
2. If $n_1 \geq 3^m$ and $n_2 \geq m$, then $n_2 P_{n_1} \equiv_m mP_{3^m}$.
3. If $n_1 \leq n_2$, then $H_{n_1}$ always embeds in $H_{n_2}$.
4. If $m \leq n_1 \leq n_2$, then $H_{n_1} \equiv_m H_{n_2}$. (follows from (1) and (2) above)
5. If $n \geq m$, then $G_n \equiv_m H_n$.

We will need the following two helper lemmas.

**Lemma C.1** *Given $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$, a path $P$ of length $\geq 3^{m+k+2}$ and a set $W$ of $l \leq k$ nodes of $P$, there exists a substructure $G$ of $P$ containing $W$, such that $G$ is a disjoint union of at most $l$ paths, each path having length at most $3^{m+k+2}$.*

*Proof*: If $W = \{a\}$ for some node $a$, then take $G$ to be the substructure induced by $a$. Else, let $W = \{a_1, \ldots, a_l\}$ be the given set of $l$ nodes of $P$ where $1 < l \leq k$. Let $a_0$ and $a_{l+1}$ be the end points of $P$. W.l.o.g., assume that for $j \in \{0, l\}$, $a_j$ and $a_{j+1}$ are consecutive, i.e. there is no $a_{j_1}$ that is strictly 'in between' $a_j$ and $a_{j+1}$ for $j_1 \in \{0, l\}$.
If the distance between $a_j$ and $a_{j+1}$ is at most $3^{m+1}$ for any $j$, then the distance between $a_1$ and $a_l$ is at most $(k-1) \times 3^{m+1} \leq 3^{m+k+2}$. Then taking $G$ to be the substructure induced by all the points of $P$ that lie in between and include $a_1$ and $a_l$, we see that $G$ is indeed as desired. Else for some $j$, the distance between $a_j$ and $a_{j+1}$ is $> 3^{m+1}$. Then let $b_1$, resp. $b_2$, be the point lying between $a_j$ and $a_{j+1}$ at a distance of exactly $3^m$ from $a_j$, resp. $a_{j+1}$. Clearly $b_1$ and $b_2$ cannot be adjacent. Then let $P_1$ be the path obtained by taking the substructure of $P$ induced by all the points lying between and including $a_0$ and $b_1$. Likewise let $P_2$ be the path obtained by taking the substructure of $P$ induced by all the points lying between and including $b_2$ and $a_{l+1}$. Then $P_1$ contains $j$ points of $W$ and $P_2$ contains $l - j$ points of $W$. Then we can perfom the above reasoning recursively on $P_1$ and $P_2$. Let $G_1$ and $G_2$ respectively be the substructures of $P$ obtained by doing the aforesaid reasonings on $P_1$ and $P_2$. Then $G_1$, resp. $G_2$,

contains $a_1, \ldots, a_j$, resp. $a_{j+1}, \ldots, a_l$, and is a disjoint union of at most $j$ paths, resp. at most $l-j$ paths, each path having length at most $3^{m+k+2}$. Then check that $G = G_1 \sqcup G_2$ is indeed as desired. ■

**Lemma C.2** *Given $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$, a cycle $C$ of length $\geq 3^{m+k+2}+2$ and a set $W$ of $l \leq k$ nodes of $C$, there exists a substructure $G$ of it containing $W$, such that $G$ is a disjoint union of at most $l$ paths, each of length at most $3^{m+k+2}$.*

*Proof*: Clearly some node of $C$ is not in $W$. Deleting this node, we get a path of length $\geq 3^{m+k+2}$ that contains $W$. Invoking Lemma C.1, we are done. ■

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.3. Consider a structure $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}$ and let $W$ be a set of at most $k$ elements of $\mathfrak{A}$. We have two cases: (a) $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_1$ (b) $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_2$.

$\underline{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_1}$:
Then $\mathfrak{A} = H_n$ for some $n$. If $n \leq (m+k+2)$, then taking $\mathfrak{B}$ to be $\mathfrak{A}$, we see that the conditions of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ are satisfied for $\mathfrak{A}$. Else $n > (m+k+2)$. Let $W^1$ be the subset of $W$ contained in the paths of $\mathfrak{A}$, of lengths $\leq 3^{m+k+2}$, and let $W^2$ be the subset of $W$ contained in paths of $\mathfrak{A}$, of lengths $> 3^{m+k+2}$.
If $W^2 = \emptyset$, then all of $W$ is contained within the paths of lengths $\leq 3^{m+k+2}$. Since $n > (m+k+2)$, it is easy to see that taking $m+k+2$ paths of each length from 0 to $3^{m+k+2}$ such that $W$ is contained in these paths, we get a substructure $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ that contains $W$ and that is isomorphic to $H_{m+k+2}$.
If $W^2 \neq \emptyset$, then let $P_1, \ldots, P_l$ be the $l \leq k$ paths of lengths $> 3^{m+k+2}$ that contain some element of $W^2$. Applying Lemma C.1 to each $P_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$ and taking the disjoint union of the substructures $G_i$ of these obtained thereof, we get a substructure $G^1$ of $G$ containing $W^2$ s.t. $G^1$ is a disjoint union of at most $k$ paths of lengths at most $3^{m+k+2}$. Now as in the previous case, we can construct a substructure $N_1$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ containing $W^1$ such that $\mathfrak{B}_1$ is isomorphic to $H_{m+k+2}$. Since $\mathfrak{B}_1$ contains $m+k+2$ paths of each length $i$ ranging from 0 to $3^{m+k+2}$, it is easy to see that 'swapping' the paths in $G^1$ with paths of same lengths in $\mathfrak{B}_1$ that do not contain any element of $W^1$, we get a substructure $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ containing all of $W$ and which is isomorphic to $H_{m+k+2}$.
In either case, we get a substructure $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ that contains $W$ and is isomorphic to $H_{m+k+2}$. Then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$. By the observations at the outset, $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$. Further, it is clear that $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq f(m)$. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfies the conditions of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$.

$\underline{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_2}$:
Then $\mathfrak{A} = C_{3^n} \sqcup H_n$. If $n \leq (m+k+2)$, then taking $\mathfrak{B}$ to be $\mathfrak{A}$, we see that the conditions of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ are satisfied for $\mathfrak{A}$. Else $n > (m+k+2)$. Let $W^1$ be the subset of $W$ contained in $C_{3^n}$ and let $W^2$ be the subset of $W$ contained in $H_n$. By the same argument as in the previous case, we can show that there exists a substructure $\mathfrak{B}_1$ of $H_n$ containing $W^2$ such that $\mathfrak{B}_1$ is isomorphic to $H_{m+k+2}$. Applying Lemma C.2 to $C_{3^n}$, we get a substructure $G^1$ of $C_{3^n}$ that contains $W^1$ and such that $G^1$ is a disjoint union of at most $|W^1|$ paths, each of length at most $3^{m+k+2}$. Since we have $m+k+2$ paths of each length $i$ ranging from 0 to $3^{m+k+2}$ in $\mathfrak{B}_1$, it is easy to see that 'swapping' the paths in $G^1$ with

paths of same lengths in $\mathfrak{B}_1$ that do not contain any element of $W^2$, we get a substructure $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ containing all of $W$ and that is isomorphic to $H_{m+k+2}$. Then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{S}$. By the observations above $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_m \mathfrak{A}$. Further, it is clear that $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq f(m)$. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfies the conditions of $\mathcal{P}^{comp}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}, k)$. ■

# D Proofs of relations between various classes

That $\mathcal{S}_4 \in \Gamma^*_{comp} \setminus \Gamma^0_{wqo}$ and $\mathcal{S}_5 \in \Gamma^*_{wqo} \setminus \Gamma^0_{comp}$ follow from Propositions 4.3 and 4.2. We show below the results conceerning $\mathcal{S}1$ and $\mathcal{S}_3$.

$\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^0_{wqo}$, $\mathcal{S}_3 \in \Gamma^0_{wqo}$

We show the reasoning for $\mathcal{S}_3$. The result for $\mathcal{S}_1$ would follow.
Let $(G_i)_{i\geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence of graphs from $\mathcal{S}_3$. Consider $G_1$ and let the size of $G_1$ be $n$. If for some $i > 1$, $G_i$ contains a path of length $2n$, then it is easy to see that $G_1 \longmapsto G_i$. Else, for all $i > 1$, all paths in $G_i$ are of length less than $2n$. Then construct a $2n$-tuple $s_i$ corresponding to $G_i$, where the $j^{\text{th}}$ component of $s_i$ is the number of paths of length $j$ in $G_i$, for $0 \leq j < 2n$. Now applying Dickson's lemma to the sequence $(s_i)_{i>1}$, we get that $s_i$ is component-wise less than $s_j$ for some $i < j$, $i > 1$. Clearly then $G_i \hookrightarrow G_j$. This shows that $\mathcal{S}_3$ belongs to $\Gamma^0_{wqo}$.

$\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^0_{comp}$, $\mathcal{S}_3 \in \Gamma^0_{comp}$

From the facts about paths mentioned in Appendix C, it follows that:

1. The computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ given by $f(m) = 3^m$ witnesses $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^0_{comp}$.
2. The computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ given by $f(m) = m \times (1+2+\ldots+3^m)$ witnesses $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^0_{comp}$.

$\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^* \setminus \Gamma^*_{logic}$, $\mathcal{S}_3 \notin \Gamma^*$

That $\mathcal{S}_3 \notin \Gamma^*$ was already shown in [11]. That $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^*$ can be shown by a reasoning similar to that in the proof of Lemma 4.4. That $\mathcal{S}_1 \notin \Gamma^*_{logic}$ can be seen as follows. Towards a contradiction, suppose $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \Gamma^*_{logic}$. Then for each $k$, there exists a function $f_k$ witnessing $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}_1, k)$. Let $k = 2$ and consider $f_2$. Given $m$, consider $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{S}_1$ s.t. $\mathfrak{A}$ is a path of length $> f_2(m)$. Let $W$ be the set consisting exactly of the end points of $\mathfrak{A}$. It is clear that the only substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ that contains $W$ and that is in $\mathcal{S}_1$ is $\mathfrak{A}$ itself. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ does not contain any substructure of size $\leq f_2(m)$ which is $m$-equivalent to $\mathfrak{A}$. This contradicts the assumption that $f_2$ witnesses $\mathcal{P}_{logic}(\mathcal{S}_1, 2)$.

# E Proof of Lemma 5.2

We will show below that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}^k, 0)$ implies $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_k, 0)$. We say that an infinite sequence $I_1$ from $\mathcal{S}_k$ is 'good' if there exist $i_1, i_2, i_3, \ldots$ where $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \ldots$ s.t. the structure at index $i_1$ in $I_1$ embeds in the structure at index $i_2$ in $I_1$,

which in turn embeds in the structure at index $i_3$ in $I_1$, and so on. We will show that every infinite sequence from $\mathcal{S}_k$ is good.
We will first prove two helper lemmas.

**Lemma E.1** *Let $I = (\mathfrak{A}_i, \bar{a}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence from $\mathcal{S}_k$ such that for any $i$, the components of $\bar{a}_i$ are distinct. Let $\Pi_1, \ldots, \Pi_{k!}$ be permutations of the set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ and let $J$ be the sequence given by $J = (\mathfrak{A}_1, \Pi_1(\bar{a}_1)), \ldots, (\mathfrak{A}_1, \Pi_{k!}(\bar{a}_1))$, $(\mathfrak{A}_2, \Pi_1(\bar{a}_2)), \ldots, (\mathfrak{A}_2, \Pi_{k!}(\bar{a}_2)), \ldots$. Then $I$ is good iff $J$ is good.*

*Proof*: If $I$ is good, then clearly $J$ is good. Suppose $J$ is good. Then there must exist some $\Pi \in \{\Pi_1, \ldots, \Pi_{k!}\}$ and some infinite subsequence $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_r}, \Pi(\bar{a}_{i_r}))_{r\geq 1}$ s.t. $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_p}, \Pi(\bar{a}_{i_p}))$ embeds in $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_r}, \Pi(\bar{a}_{i_r}))$ each $p < r$, $p \geq 1$. Then $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_p}, \Pi^{-1}(\Pi(\bar{a}_{i_p})))$ embeds in $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_r}, \Pi^{-1}(\Pi(\bar{a}_{i_r})))$, where $\Pi^{-1}$ is the inverse permutation of $\Pi$. Then $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_p}, \bar{a}_{i_p})$ embeds in $(\mathfrak{A}_{i_r}, \bar{a}_{i_r})$ for each $p < r$, $p \geq 1$, showing that $I$ is good. ■

**Lemma E.2** *Let $J$ be an infinite sequence from $\mathcal{S}_k$ given by $J = (\mathfrak{A}_1, \Pi_1(\bar{a}_1)), \ldots, (\mathfrak{A}_1, \Pi_{k!}(\bar{a}_1))$, $(\mathfrak{A}_2, \Pi_1(\bar{a}_2)), \ldots, (\mathfrak{A}_2, \Pi_{k!}(\bar{a}_2)), \ldots$, where $\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathcal{S}$, the components of $\bar{a}_i$ are distinct and $\Pi_1, \ldots \Pi_{k!}$ are as in the previous lemma. Then $J$ is good.*

*Proof*: Let $P_i$ be the set of the components of $\bar{a}_i$. Consider the sequence $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)_{i\geq 1}$ from $\mathcal{S}^k$. Since $\mathcal{S}^k$ is a w.q.o. under $\hookrightarrow$, there exists an infinite subsequence $(\mathfrak{A}_{i,j}, P_{i,j})_{j\geq 1}$ s.t. $(\mathfrak{A}_{i,p}, P_{i,p}) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{A}_{i,r}, P_{i,r})$ for each $p < r$, $p \geq 1$. Then there must exist permutations $\Pi_{j_{i,1}}, \Pi_{j_{i,2}}, \ldots$ s.t. $(\mathfrak{A}_{i,p}, \Pi_{j_{i,p}}(\bar{a}_{i,p})) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{A}_{i,r}, \Pi_{j_{i,r}}(\bar{a}_{i,r}))$ for each $p < r$, $p \geq 1$. Then $J$ is a good sequence. ■
We now complete the proof of Lemma 5.2. Assume that we are given an infinite sequence $I_1$ from $\mathcal{S}_k$. Let $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ be the constants of $\tau_k \setminus \tau$. Let $\Lambda$ be the finite set of all 'types' of equalities/inequalities between $c_1, \ldots, c_k$. Label each structure $(\mathfrak{A}, a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ of $I_1$ with the (unique) type of $\Lambda$ that is realized by the elements $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ in $\mathfrak{A}$. Since $\Lambda$ is finite, there must exist an infinite subsequence $I_2$ of $I_1$ s.t. the type of the equalities/inequalities between $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ is the same in all the structures of $I_2$. W.l.o.g. then, we can assume that the interpretations of $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ are different from each other in all the structures of $I_2$. Then it follows from Lemmas E.1 and E.2 that $I_2$ must be good. Whence $I_1$ is good. ■

# F Proof of Lemma 5.5

We present the proof for (1); the proof for (2) is almost identical.
The base case is easy to check. As the induction hypothesis, suppose for $l < m$ that the duplicator has won in an $l$ round EF game between $(r_1, a_1, b_1)$ and $(r_2, a_2, b_2)$ following the strategy $\alpha$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathsf{D}^i$ be the set of elements chosen from $r_i$. Let $g : \mathsf{D}^1 \to \mathsf{D}^2$ be the partial isomorphism between $(r_1, a_1, b_1)$ and $(r_2, a_2, b_2)$. As the induction step, suppose that at the end of the $(l+1)^{\text{th}}$ round, the elements chosen from $r_1$ and $r_2$ are resp. $e_1$ and $e_2$. We will assume $e_i \notin \mathsf{D}^i$. We now show that $h = g \cup \{(e_1, e_2)\}$ is a partial isomorphism between $(r_1, a_1, b_1)$ and $(r_2, a_2, b_2)$. There are two cases here:

1. $e_1 \in \mathsf{U}_{s_1}$: By definition of $\alpha$, it follows that $h$ restricted to $\mathsf{U}_{s_1}$ is a partial isomorphism between $(s_1, a_1)$ and $(s_2, a_2)$. Then the only thing needed to be shown to complete the proof is that $r_1 \models (e_1 \leq c)$ iff $r_2 \models (h(e_1) \leq h(c))$ for elements $c$ in $\mathsf{D}^1 \cap \mathsf{U}_{\mathsf{f}_1}$. Observe that $h(c)$ must then belong to $\mathsf{U}_{\mathsf{f}_2}$. Towards this, we see from the construction of $r_1$ that (i) $r_1 \models (e_1 \leq c)$ iff $r_1 \models (e_1 \leq a_1)$ and (ii) $r_2 \models (e_2 \leq h(c))$ iff $r_2 \models (e_2 \leq a_2)$. But since $h$ restricted to $\mathsf{U}_{s_1}$ is a partial isomorphism between $(s_1, a_1)$ and $(s_2, a_2)$, we have $r_1 \models (e_1 \leq a_1)$ iff $r_2 \models (e_2 \leq a_2)$.
2. $e_1 \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathsf{f}_1}$: By similar reasoning as above, we just need to show that $r_1 \models (c \leq e_1)$ iff $r_2 \models (h(c) \leq h(e_1))$ for elements $c$ in $\mathsf{D}^1 \cap \mathsf{U}_{s_1}$. Observe that $h(c)$ must then belong to $\mathsf{U}_{s_2}$. By the construction of $r_1$, we have (i) $r_1 \models (c \leq e_1)$ iff $r_1 \models (c \leq a_1)$ and (ii) $r_2 \models (h(c) \leq e_2)$ iff $r_2 \models (h(c) \leq a_2)$. But since $h$ restricted to $\mathsf{U}_{s_1}$ is a partial isomorphism between $(s_1, a_1)$ and $(s_2, a_2)$, we have $r_1 \models (c \leq a_1)$ iff $r_2 \models (h(c) \leq a_2)$.
By induction then, $(r_1, a_1, b_1) \equiv_m (r_2, a_2, b_2)$. ■

# G Operations for constructing new classes

We give below the definitions of the disjoint union and cartesian product operations.

1. The *disjoint union* of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, denoted $\mathfrak{A} \sqcup \mathfrak{B}$, is the structure $\mathfrak{C}$ defined upto isomorphism as follows. Let $\mathfrak{B}'$ be an isomorphic copy of $\mathfrak{B}$ such that the universes of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ are disjoint. Then, (a) $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{C}} = \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cup \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}'}$ (b) $\mathfrak{C}(\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}) = \mathfrak{A}$ and $M(\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}'}) = \mathfrak{B}'$ (c) for each predicate $R \in \tau$, of arity $k$, and for each $k$-tuple $\bar{a}$ of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ such that $\bar{a}$ contains at least one element from each of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}'}$, we have $\mathfrak{C} \models \neg R(\bar{a})$.

2. The *cartesian product* of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, denoted $\mathfrak{A} \times \mathfrak{B}$, is the structure $\mathfrak{C}$ defined as: (a) $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{C}} = \{(a, b) \mid a \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{A}}, b \in \mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{B}}\}$ (b) For each predicate $R \in \tau$, of arity $k$, for each $k$-tuple $\big((a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_k, b_k)\big)$ of $\mathsf{U}_{\mathfrak{C}}$, we have $\mathfrak{C} \models R\big((a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_k, b_k)\big)$ iff $\big((a_1 = \cdots = a_k \wedge \mathfrak{B} \models R(b_1, \ldots, b_k)) \bigvee (\mathfrak{A} \models R(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \wedge b_1 = \cdots = b_k)\big)$.

# H Proof of Lemma 6.1

1) Suppose $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_i, k)$ holds for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We will use the definition of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ as given by Lemma 5.2 for reasoning about ! and $\sqcup$. For $\times$ and $\otimes$, we will use the definition of $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}, k)$ as given by Definition 3.1.

Let $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be an infinite sequence from $(!\mathcal{S}_1)^k$. Then consider the infinite sequence $(!\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)_{i \geq 1}$ from $\mathcal{S}_1^k$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_1, k)$ holds, we have by Lemma 5.2, that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_1^k, 0)$ holds. Then there exist $i, j$ where $i < j$ s.t. $(!\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i) \hookrightarrow (!\mathfrak{A}_j, P_j)$. Let $f$ be an embedding from $(!\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)$ to $(!\mathfrak{A}_j, P_j)$. Then from prop-

erty P1 of !, it follows that $f$ is also an embedding from $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)$ to $(\mathfrak{A}_j, P_j)$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{S}_2$ and suppose $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is an infinite sequence from $\mathcal{S}^k$. Let $\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{B}_i^1 \sqcup \mathfrak{B}_i^2$ where $\mathfrak{B}_i^l \in \mathcal{S}_l$ for $l \in \{1,2\}$. Let $P_i^l$ be the subset of the universe of $\mathfrak{B}_i^l$ s.t. the disjoint union of $P_i^1$ and $P_i^2$ is $P_i$. Construct the pair $H_i = \big((\mathfrak{B}_i^1, P_i^1), (\mathfrak{B}_i^2, P_i^2)\big)$ and consider the sequence $(H_i)_{i\geq 1}$. For each $l \in \{1,2\}$, since $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_l, k)$ holds, we have by Lemma 5.2 that $\mathcal{P}_{wqo}(\mathcal{S}_l^k, 0)$ holds. Then there must exist $i, j$ where $i < j$ s.t. $(\mathfrak{B}_i^l, P_i^l) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{B}_j^l, P_j^l)$ for each $l \in \{1,2\}$. Then from property P1 of $\sqcup$, it follows that $(\mathfrak{A}_i, P_i) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{A}_j, P_j)$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \circledast \mathcal{S}_2$ for $\circledast \in \{\times, \otimes\}$. Suppose $(\mathfrak{A}_i, a_i^1, \ldots, a_i^k)_{i\geq 1}$ is an infinite sequence from $\mathcal{S}_k$. Let $\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{B}_i^1 \circledast \mathfrak{B}_i^2$ where $\mathfrak{B}_i^l \in \mathcal{S}_l$ for $l \in \{1,2\}$. Let $b_i^{1,l} \ldots b_i^{k,l}$ be the elements of the universe of $\mathfrak{B}_i^l$ s.t. $a_i^1 = (b_i^{1,1}, b_i^{1,2}), \ldots, a_i^k = (b_i^{k,1}, b_i^{k,2})$. Constructing the pair $H_i = \big((\mathfrak{B}_i^1, b_i^{1,1} \ldots b_i^{k,1}), (\mathfrak{B}_i^2, b_i^{1,2} \ldots b_i^{k,2})\big)$ and reasoning as in the previous paragraph, it follows that there must exist $i, j$ where $i < j$ s.t. $(\mathfrak{A}_i, a_i^1, \ldots, a_i^k) \hookrightarrow (\mathfrak{A}_j, a_j^1, \ldots, a_j^k)$.

2) The proofs for $\mathcal{P}_{logic}^{comp}$ can be done using similar ideas as shown above. We just mention the computable functions in each case. Let $\alpha_i$ be the computable function witnessing $\mathcal{P}_{logic}^{comp}(\mathcal{S}_i, k)$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$. Then

1. the function $\alpha_1$ witnesses $\mathcal{P}_{logic}^{comp}(\mathcal{S}_1, k)$.
2. the function $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ witnesses $\mathcal{P}_{logic}^{comp}(\mathcal{S}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{S}_2, k)$.
3. the function $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$ witnesses $\mathcal{P}_{logic}^{comp}(\mathcal{S}_1 \circledast \mathcal{S}_2, k)$ for $\circledast \in \{\times, \otimes\}$.